The Perkins School *of* Theology

JOURNAL

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

SPECIAL INAUGURAL ISSUE

SYMPOSIUM: Contemporary Theological Concern

QUADRANGLE NEWS

ALUMNI NEWS

BOOK REVIEWS

SPRING NUMBER: 1955
Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

THE PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY JOURNAL

"Let us unite the two so long divided — knowledge and vital piety." — John Wesley

Volume VIII SPRING NUMBER 1955 Number III

Southern Methodist University Press

CONTENTS

DEDICATION ... 3

SYMPOSIUM: Contemporary Theological Concern ... 4
Backgrounds and Patterns in Contemporary Theology ... *Albert C. Oulter* 4
Revelation and Reason ... *Herndon Wagers* 11
The Theological Approach to the Interpretation of the Bible ... *Fred D. Gealy* 15
The Nature and Function of Christian Education ... *Charles H. Johnson* 19
Contemporary Theological Concern in Preaching ... *Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.* 23

QUADRANGLE NEWS ... 28

ALUMNI NEWS ... 29

BOOK REVIEWS ... 32

SUMMER SCHOOL ... 47

Editor ... *Howard Grimes*

Book Review Editor ... *Fred D. Gealy*

Alumni News ... *William A. Irwin*

Student News ... *Fenton Wicker, Jr.*

THE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

William A. Irwin, Chairman; Howard Grimes; John H. Hicks; Earl B. Marlatt

The Perkins School of Theology Journal is edited for the alumni of the school and for the Methodist ministers of the South Central Jurisdiction. The Publications and Publicity Committee of the School of Theology is in charge of the project.

The Journal is published three times a year by the Perkins School of Theology, with the approval of The Board of Publications of Southern Methodist University.

This issue of

THE PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY JOURNAL

is dedicated to

Willis McDonald Tate

on the occasion of his inauguration as

the fifth President

of

Southern Methodist University

May 5, 1955 at 10:00 a.m.
in McFarlin Auditorium

O GOD OF TRUTH AND LIGHT, who hast brought us to this high hour in this good place and who dost call us to seek Thy truth and walk in Thy light as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ, hear us now as we offer to Thee the gifts which Thou hast bestowed on us—that our lives may be dedicated afresh and made obedient to Thy will, to the end that this University shall come more and more to manifest the true unity of sound learning and vital piety . . .

TO THE CONVICTION that the Christian faith provides us with our distinctive perspective as a university in every proper enterprise and purpose,

We dedicate ourselves, O God, in humility and confidence.

—From the Litany prepared for use at the inauguration, by the Inaugural Committee, Albert Outler, Chairman.

SYMPOSIUM

CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL CONCERN

I. INTRODUCTION

CONTEMPORARY theology offers a kaleidoscopic interpretation of the Gospel which must be highly confusing to the general reader, as, indeed, it often is to the more specialized theologian. Yet there is emerging a heartening amount of agreement in contemporary theology. For example (as the first article in this symposium points out), few theologians are unreconstructed liberals. All have reacted in some way to the crisis in which we are living. A further, and more fundamental, agreement concerns the importance of theologizing. This is especially obvious in the two articles on Christian education and preaching, and is also common in all areas of communicating the gospel. Further, there seems to be general concensus that what we are ultimately concerned about in theologizing is the discovery of the meaning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for our day and age. This is especially evident in Biblical theology, as the article in this area indicates. Further, all theologians are concerned in one way or another with the way in which this meaning comes to us, and thus the nature of revelation and its relation to faith is central. There is also a heartening amount of agreement concerning the nature of revelation, as discussed in the article in this symposium concerned with this topic.

This symposium has two purposes: first, to indicate what some of the contemporary trends are, and second, to show the relationship of this concern to the more "practical" matter of communicating the Gospel. The writers of the symposium are all professors in Perkins School of Theology, three of them having joined the faculty this year. They are not in agreement completely, for it is not the purpose of Perkins to present a united theological front. They *are* in essential agreement concerning the importance of this process of seeking to interpret the meaning of God's self-revelation to people today.

It is the hope of all of us that out of this process may come a clearer voice speaking a word of judgment and a word of peace, making relevant to our day the age-old story of God's search for his prodigal children.

—H. G.

II. BACKGROUNDS AND PATTERNS IN CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY

By ALBERT. C. OUTLER

WHERE IS THE dividing line between *historical* and *contemporary* theology? How can we mark the border between the living present and the remembered past—the past that can be made alive again only by an act of historical imagination? This is a difficult question, for the division is seldom clear cut and it tends to

vary according to different theological perspectives. On the other hand, one's theological perspective is determined, in large measure, by his reaction to his past, as he remembers it. Thus, we need to have some idea as to how far back our own current theology reaches and how far forward into our present thought the recent past comes down.

When I was a theological student, courses in Contemporary Theology usually began with Schleiermacher—and emphasized the decisive break with traditional Christianity he and his fellow liberal theologians achieved. Nowadays it is plain to almost everyone that the perspectives of Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Bowne have receded beyond recovery. The theologies developed in the atmosphere of the Nineteenth Century have simply ceased to be contemporary: in a very important sense, they are as noncurrent as the theologies of Wesley, Luther, and Augustine. They are within reach of our historical recall but even when we undertake this we recognize that they belong to a different setting from the one in which we stand. The Nineteenth Century is *past* and its world view has become an item of *history* to the vast majority of thoughtful *contemporary* Christians. In this sense, all theologies which can properly be called current or up-to-date have to be understood in the light of their relation to the Nineteenth Century and to the theological tendencies which it represented.

The modern world has been in profound turmoil ever since the seismic upheavals of the First World War. Every dimension and aspect of modern life has been affected by a multiform, poly-phased revolution which has reached into every level and dimension of thought and life. Even if we cannot understand them, all of us are aware of the drastic and pervasive changes in the notions and tempers and outlook of men and women in the last three decades. As usual, our poets and artists and seers have given us the clearest and most penetrating glimpses into the character of our time. Take a poem like Robert Penn Warren's *Brother to Dragons,* an essay like Camus' *Man in Revolt,* a novel like William Faulkner's *Intruder in the Dust,* a picture like Picasso's *Guernica,* or a mantic vision like Toynbee's *Study of History* (especially vol. IX)—and you have five random witnesses from a thousand similar ones whose varied testimony is unanimous. They all agree that modern man has come to be rudely disenchanted with himself and deeply anxious about the meaning of human existence, as his Nineteenth Century grandfathers rarely ever were.

One of the most useful clues to an understanding of the demoralization of contemporary culture—the ruthless and breathless struggle of "the cold war," the distempers of our domestic affairs, the hysterias about patriotism, the titanic struggles for titanic power, the horrid suspense of our race between catastrophe and peace—is to recognize that somewhere, at the bottom of it all, we are undergoing the shock of grief and bereavement over the dissolution of an old epoch and the anxious travail of a new era whose shape and quality are as yet unknown since it is still being moulded in the struggles of our current crisis.

The familiar title of the old epoch whose passing we mourn was the *Age of Enlightenment.* It was one of the really great creative periods of human history; in more ways than one it deserved K. S. Latourette's characterization of it, "The Great Century." It began somewhere around 1775 and it began to end in 1914. We are still trying to come to grips with what it did and what it failed to do; with the residues it left us, both good and bad. Old epochs never die—they just fade away—and every new one has to reweave much of the old into its own new fabric.

It is commonplace that if Christian theology is to be contemporary and relevant it must speak to its own epoch. Thus when

the historical context of a given theology changes, some corresponding change must also occur in the theological patterns. Theologians may simply shift from the offensive to the defensive, as some spokesmen of the Nineteenth Century Liberal Theology have done. One thing we can say for certain: the Liberal Theology of the Nineteenth Century was a *contemporary* theology for *that* century. It succeeded, with uncommon faithfulness, in accommodating itself to the basic ideas and motifs of the Age of Enlightenment.

To understand the Liberal Theology, therefore, one must have some idea, even if only a bare skeletal notion, of the main themes of the Enlightenment and its typical perspective. With a summary comprehension of what the Enlightenment was trying to say, we can then form a critical appraisal of our own *post*-Enlightenment era. Let us list in the briefest possible fashion, then, the main motifs of the thought and perspective of the Enlightenment and the Liberal Theology which it inspired:

1. The rejection of the traditional patterns of *authority,* whether of the Church, the Bible, or the civil State. The center of gravity was shifted from *outside* man to *inside* personal experience, and the consequences of this for political, intellectual and cultural life have been tremendous.
2. The rejection of the older, traditional concepts of *revelation,* which insisted upon the primacy of faith and the divine *initiative* in all religious experience and knowledge.
3. The rejection of the traditional doctrines of *sin,* which had insisted upon the radically tragic character of human existence. This was accompanied by a rejection of traditional doctrines of *salvation* which had insisted on justification by faith alone.
4. The discovery, by the romantic poets and the idealist philosophers, of the *human self* as the font of true knowledge, the clue of reality, the focus of all significant values.
5. A general commitment to *the scientific method* as the most productive mode of human inquiry—and, just possibly, an omnicompetent one.
6. A shift from the emphasis upon ethics as the *fruit* of religious faith to a stress on ethics as the *measure* of religious values.
7. The assertion that *political* liberty, rather than something like economic liberty or "freedom from want and fear," is the primary archetype of human freedom from which all the other blessings of democracy naturally flow.
8. A vision of *man's possible conquest of nature,* viewed either as benign or at least passively ripe for human exploitation.
9. The thoroughgoing application of *the literary-historical methods of critical study* to the Bible, to the life of Jesus, to the history of Christianity as an item in the history of religions.
10. A new confidence in the *perfectibility* of the human condition and high hopes for man's indefinite capacity for *progress.*

Notions like these, combined with the revolutionary impact of the Industrial Revolution and the geographical expansion of the influence of west European civilization, made of the Enlightenment and its century quite an extraordinary time in human affairs, an epoch to which we are heirs even though we declare our independence of it. Some of the incidental ambivalences of the Liberal Century—colonialism, white supremacy, extreme economic individualism—have left us with massive difficulties that continue to haunt us. At the same time, its main thrusts—science, reason, technology—remain as an inheritance we could not decline even if we should want to.

Still, even as we glance over this bare summary of Enlightenment motifs, we recog-

nize how irrecoverably they have slipped into *history*. For good or ill, these are not any longer the basic, effective convictions of our living present. Part of the widespread anxiety we see in ourselves and our fellows is generated by the realization that the high hopes and great expectations of the Enlightenment have failed us. The science we hailed as Messiah has indeed saved us—and yet continues to threaten us with new dangers that are past conceiving. We have recorded triumphant progress in almost every field—and yet every triumph seems to generate an accompanying frustration which mars our full enjoyment of it. We have learned more about the world and ourselves than *any* generation of man *ever* knew before—and we are less certain than any as to what our knowledge really means.

It is, then, a striking fact that each single motif we have mentioned as typical of the Age of Enlightenment has come under severe criticism in our time—and has had to be *re*-formulated in a new perspective if it is to be maintained at all! Everywhere there is a new search for authority, a new disposition to take the possibility of revelation seriously, a deep and earnest reconsideration of the meaning of the Christian evangel. There is a widespread and massive dubiety concerning the adequacy of all rationalist systems, and a new insistence upon the primacy of faith, the centrality of Jesus Christ, the life of grace, and the Christian *koinonia*.

Contemporary theology is the effort to comprehend and communicate the Christian message in this new epoch of reaction, transition, and travail. Ask a theologian how he stands toward the emphases and patterns of Enlightenment Theology, and you'll be able to locate him rather accurately on the current theological map. A theological notion is *contemporary* in the degree that it fully faces the fixed gulf that separates us from the Nineteenth Century—and seeks to deal with the resulting situation. A theological notion is out of date in the degree that it ignores the waning of the Enlightenment and tries to maintain itself, as if the world of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Bowne were still the one in which *we* live. Thus all *contemporary* theology is *post*-Enlightenment theology!

Yet the range of reaction within this common category is extremely diverse. Barth and DeWolf, Aulen and Horton, Bultmann and Farrer—are all *contemporary* theologians. Yet they differ very widely in almost every aspect of their theological spirit and method. If we are to sort them out and schematize their differences, we must look for some sort of typology (or taxonomy) among them. The one that has proved most useful in my own efforts to classify and relate contemporary theologians and their work is one which measures them *against their Nineteenth Century background*. It is, admittedly, a sort of projection (like any map maker must use) but it is sufficiently flexible to allow for adjustments and differences of judgment as to where a given man or idea belongs.

Thus I would suggest that there are three main types of Contemporary Theology, with several sub-types under each. The first I would call (borrowing a phrase from Pareto) PERSISTENT RESIDUES OF NINETEENTH CENTURY THEOLOGY. In this group we find theologians who have fully faced the fact of radical change, and yet are deliberately seeking to preserve as much of the Enlightenment legacy as possible, with revision and reformulation as they find it necessary in order to translate the old into the current idioms of thought. Reading from left to right in this type, we can recognize three sub-types: *Unitarian* liberalism, *Evangelical* liberalism, and *Fundamentalism*. The first would be represented by men like Harrison Elliott, C. J. Cadoux, H. N. Wieman, Bernard Meland, and Erwin Goodenough. The second sub-type has a very wide spread and a high level of distinction. Here we would "place" people like Herbert Farmer, Walter Marshall Horton,

Georgia Harkness, H. P. Van Dusen, Harold DeWolf, Charles Raven.

To some, it may seem surprising to put *Fundamentalism* cheek-by-jowl with *Liberalism.* They have little in common in theological temper or substance, and yet they are alike in trying to preserve as much as possible of their own respective Nineteenth Century residues. Fundamentalism is the result of an effort of right wing Protestantism to *defy* the Nineteenth Century, just as *Liberalism* was an effort to *adjust* to the Nineteenth Century. In the post-Nineteenth Century world, Fundamentalism continues to hang on to these reactionary features. We can list, briefly, the unique emphases which are to be found in Fundamentalism, in its various forms, and which mark it off from authentic Christian orthodoxy:

1. An insistence on the verbal inspiration and literal authority of the Bible: "the words of the Bible are the words of God." This excludes the possibility of historical critical study and tends to absolutize the Bible. In the name of biblical orthodoxy, Fundamentalism becomes heterodox in its doctrine of the Bible!
2. A contention that the Biblical miracles are positive proof of revelation; hence, they are bound up with a biblical faith and all stand or fall together. In the name of biblical revelation, Fundamentalism obscures the concrete reality of God's *Self*-revelation in the Bible!
3. A general hostility toward scientific inquiry and a general indifference to the problem of "Christ and culture." In the name of faith, Fundamentalism makes Christianity *archaic!*
4. A typical emphasis upon a forensic substitutionary doctrine of atonement which explicitly differentiates the justice of God the Father from the mercy of God the Son, thus "dividing the substance of the Godhead." In the name of the biblical emphasis on atonement, Fundamentalism violates one of the most solemn injunctions of the Athanasian Creed!

Fundamentalism is a complex phenomenon—and appears to be waxing in strength. It has a highly literate vanguard of men like S. G. Craig, E. J. Carnell, Orton Wiley, L. S. Chafer, and Cornelius Van Til. But it ought never to be confused with other contemporary efforts to recover or maintain Christian *orthodoxy.* The best way to avoid this confusion is to read Van Til's *The New Modernism,* in which it turns out that "the new modernists" are Barth and Brunner!

A second main type in contemporary theology might be labeled REVIVALS OF PRE-NINETEENTH CENTURY PATTERNS. Here we find the efforts to recover and to represent the theological patterns of some earlier great epoch of Christian faith: say the Sixteenth or the Thirteenth century. In this connection, we may think of men like Karl Barth and Emil Brunner among the Protestants; Gregory Dix, Lionel Thornton, E. L. Mascall among the Anglo-Catholics; Jacques Maritain and Dietrich von Hildebrand among the Romans.

Karl Barth began his theological career in a violent wrestle with the problem of *revelation.* He found his essential clues in Luther and St. Paul. Then after a decade, his work underwent a decisive shift (between 1928-33) and he launched the most massive theological undertaking in Christian theologizing, a systematic theology which already exceeds the *Summa Theologiae* in length! Barth's theology is essentially a theology of grace. For him, Christianity begins and ends in God's revelation. The content of God's revelation is Jesus Christ—His unmerited favor to man in grace—Jesus Christ who is Word, Son, Saviour. Emil Brunner has repeatedly asserted that he stands where Barth stands, and Barth has repeatedly denied that this is so. We cannot stop here to adjudicate the quarrel between them—except to comment that Barth is nearer to the purely *religious* impulses of the Reformation, whereas Brunner (with his concern for a Protestant apologetic) has found it necessary to include a large admix-

ture of scholasticism, with its unavoidable but unavowed religious metaphysics. Barth has the more consistent theology; Brunner the better theological cause (if only he could shift his premises!)

Over against these Reformation emphases we may observe a parallel revival of *pre*-Reformation thought in Anglo-Catholics like Dix, Thornton, and Mascall. Theirs, too, is a theology of grace but it is not based upon the principle of *sola fide.* Instead, it rests upon a realistic metaphysics, a doctrine of the analogy of being, and the basic conviction that the cosmological approach is a valid way from man's knowledge of creation to his knowledge of the Creator.

Among the *Roman* Catholics there is a widespread revival of interest in pre-Reformation philosophy and theology—and a new theological dogma to exercise the theologians! At the same time there are interesting signs of ferment and change in the traditional Roman attitude toward what it once denounced as "modernism." For example, we see a much less defensive attitude toward the methods of biblical criticism and other "modernistic" developments which had been so roundly condemned in the *Syllabus Errorum.* One might venture the comment that the possibilities of a theological revival among Romans are greater now than they have been since the Council of Trent.

The third type of Contemporary Theology we might call, with some vagueness, EMERGENT ECLECTIC THEOLOGIES. These are theologies of one sort or another which deliberately seek to renew themselves from *both* Nineteenth *and* pre-Nineteenth century sources. Reinhold Niebuhr is a good example of this type. He began his theological work as an ardent preacher of the liberal social ethics, with his theological roots deep in the Old Testament prophets and with an extraordinarily penetrating understanding of the import of the Marxian and Freudian revolutions in the modern world. Thereafter, even as he went on to discover deeper dimensions and a new relevance in the Pauline, Augustinian, Lutheran traditions (becoming meanwhile the foremost contemporary interpreter of the Christian doctrine of man) he has neither repudiated his Nineteenth Century heritage nor tried to retain it untransformed. Paul Tillich is another example of a different sort, but of the same type. Here is a man deeply immersed in the idealistic philosophies of the Enlightenment (e.g., Schelling) who has trans-valued his Nineteenth Century legacy by an immense and creative effort to comprehend the Christian tradition as a whole and to be constantly sensitive to the emerging concerns of this present generation. It is quite a feat to hold Luther, Schelling, and Erich Fromm in productive synthesis!

This group of emergent theologies has a baffling spread but at least *this* common character: having repudiated the Enlightenment as a controlling perspective, they are all endeavouring to salvage its residues within a more explicitly orthodox and biblical understanding of the Gospel. The names in this group which spring most readily to mind illustrate this: Richard Niebuhr, Robert L. Calhoun, Austin Farrer, Rudolph Bultman, Nels Ferre', Alan Richardson.

It goes without saying that "the new era" in theology has been neither static nor uniform. Indeed we can already mark off two important phases through which we have passed in the *contemporary* period, and we can give a hesitant characterization of the phase into which we have now entered.

A convenient landmark for this *first* phase of our current theological epoch would be Karl Barth's *Roemerbrief* (first edition, 1919; second edition, 1922). This announced both Barth's negative themes of protest and reaction against the Enlightenment and also his positive themes of God's sovereign freedom in revelation and His sheer unmerited grace in man's salvation. Slowly, in the '20s, the theological world became aware of a revolt against the liberal tradition in which Barth's voice was only one among many—

a peremptory challenge which could still not be set aside just because it was so extreme. Only a few people in America were deeply affected by this turmoil in European theology. But, even so, the decade of the '20s was a time of unrest and low pressure in American theological circles.

The *second* phase in contemporary theology can be handily symbolized by the publication, in 1932, of Reinhold Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society.* Here was an original and effective application of the new theology to the problems of ethics and society, which reflected a new disenchantment with the human condition and a new bi-focal vision of the human quandary. The leading problem of the first phase of our theological era had been *revelation.* The leading problem of the second phase was *the nature of man.*

Then, gradually, as a broad consensus began to form around the ideas of God's initiative and man's sinfulness, the *third* and present phase of contemporary theology began to open up. It is characterized by a set of old questions which have come now to sound as if they were brand new. What *is* the gospel? *Who* is the Saviour? What *are* the data on which our Christian faith and hope reliably depend? What is the true nature of our Christian *koinonia?* These questions have become the guide lines of the current phase of contemporary theology and the fact that they are still in urgent ferment helps us to identify the ongoings and uncompleted tasks of Christian thought today and tomorrow. If one wants a convenient *symbol* for the beginning of this current "phase," one might use the date of Rudolph Bultmann's famous essay on demythologizing the New Testament (1941). It seems clear that Bultmann has certainly succeeded in asking the right *question* for our particular time, even if his *answer* seems grievously inadequate to many of us.

There are many signs that the winds of reaction and protest against the Enlightenment and the old Liberal Theology are blowing themselves out. The "squall-line" has passed through most of the centers of up-to-date theological study. Even the pious hope of preserving the older liberalism intact is now recognized as more wistful than realistic. By the same token, the negative criticism of "neo-orthodoxy" has not furnished us with an adequately constructive basis for theological work required by the situation now before us. A new biblicism will not suffice, nor will the old fideism. The problem that confronts us now, in its simplest form, is how to build a constructive theology which will be as relevant to the new age into which we are being thrust *as the old theology was for its age.* Such an enterprise must be biblically grounded, historically oriented, ecumenical in temper — with Christian evangelism, Christian nurture and the Christian criticism of culture as its constant concerns.

In an undertaking like this, all sorts of contributions will be needed, and it may be doubted that any of the present dominant theological positions provides us with a ready-made or wholly adequate guide. The heartening thing to me is that there are so many different people, in all the churches and theological schools, who are becoming more and more alive to the challenge and opportunities of our theological "moment." There is now a large and goodly company of those who are joining in the difficult business of re-thinking the Christian message for our time—to the end that the Gospel of Jesus Christ may be proclaimed to *our* age in truth and power.

The first half of our century was a time of theological crisis, transition, and ordeal. There is no clear indication that we shall fare any more easily or securely in the second half of the century. But the signs begin to gather that suggest a warrant for eager expectation: the theological enterprise in the Christian community has before it a great prospect of achievement and service in which we may all share as we find our place in this ongoing mystery of the Christian community in history.

III. REVELATION AND REASON

By Herndon Wagers

"UNDERSTANDING is the reward of faith. Therefore seek not to understand that thou mayest believe, but believe that thou mayest understand." Thus wrote St. Augustine some sixteen hundred years ago. Subsequent generations have by no means been uniform in their reaction to the position represented in these words, some finding in them a mood and perspective quite alien to the characteristic mentality of their time. For the contemporary theological scene, however, the great Bishop of Hippo might have been writing yesterday, his words bearing a profound relevance to a vital and urgent issue in contemporary Christian life and thought.

The question of the relation of revelation and reason has been with the church from St. Paul onward. It has persisted and will continue to persist as one of the most vital issues of Christian experience simply because every generation is faced with the task of proclaiming the Good News of God's revelation in Jesus Christ in terms which touch the quick of that generation's mind, its deepest problems, and its inescapable challenges.

Looking at the issue from the manward side it takes the form, of course, of the relation of faith and reason, faith being the human response to the revelatory event. It is not uncommon to hear our age described as an age that has lost its faith. And in attempting to be more precise in characterizing our situation some will say that we live in an age of reason, men no longer being willing to believe in truths proclaimed by faith, the vacuum resulting therefrom constituting the crisis faced by modern man. Others will describe the situation quite differently. They will say that the loss of faith has brought upon us an age of unreason, that our plight would not be nearly so critical if we had not lost the kind of fundamental moorings that can give human intelligence a meaningful orientation within which to work.

What we seem to have in these two perspectives is a distinctively different understanding of what a vital Christian faith may in fact mean when and where it is the genuine ground for the life of an individual or a culture. From one point of view we would seem to have faith conceived as an addendum to reason: we know by faith certain crucial truths which reason can never yield. From the other perspective we have the suggestion that faith is in some way a condition for the free and creative exercise of reason itself, that when men lose faith they also lose their true ground for the depths and breadths of responsible reasoning.

If these respective views are brought under careful critical scrutiny, and translated into their theological equivalents, it will be found that they are miles apart on the relation of faith and reason in Christian thought and practice. The first argument says, in essence, that revelation (and the response of faith) makes available to man a set of crucial truths which human reason can never yield. The other position holds, on the contrary, that revelation (faith), rightly conceived, does not provide the human mind with "truths" in the usual sense of the term at all, but rather it provides the fundamental orientation of one's total being within which the reason pursues truth in any area or dimension whatsoever. With proper qualifications and refinements with respect to both positions, it can be said that this latter perspective falls within the general Augustinian tradition, while the former has close affinity with the Thomistic strain in Roman Catholicism or with Protestant Fundamentalism. Probably no issue

has greater relevance and greater urgency for the contemporary Christian mind than that which confronts us here, namely, the meaning of revelation in man's experience of the saving knowledge of God. And it seems clear that the main drift of Protestant thought today is in the direction of a re-affirmation of the Augustinian perspective with ever mounting interest in the exploration of its depths and relevance for the renewing of the Christian mind and spirit.

But any discussion of the revival in our day of the Augustinian perspective on the relation of revelation and reason must be done within the context of the past hundred years or so of Protestant thought. The fact is that the whole concept of revelation, as such, has suffered severely in modern times. Whatever the detailed interpretation, revelation has traditionally been understood to be of a piece with the Christian doctrine of the *transcendence* of God and of the divine disclosure. And whatever the respective strength and weakness of the Liberal Movement in Protestantism (and the weakness should never be so emphasized as to fail in appreciation of the greatness of its accomplishments: for example, its hard won victories achieved against religious legalism and an unawakened social conscience) it did go exceedingly far in a de-emphasis of the concept of divine transcendence. As the literature and preaching of the times clearly indicate, the most representative expression of the Liberal Protestant mind was in terms of a concept of divine immanence. In accord with the general optimism of the times, the "divine in man," as a present fact and a future promise, was so exalted as to suggest that revelation simply represents the progress of human discovery, inspired by the spirit and devotion of Jesus.

But as recent history has shown, an emphasis of this kind, where transcendence is swallowed up in immanence, leads toward a culture-centered rather than a God-centered religion. God is here all too easily conceived as an instrument for the realization of certain cultural ideals. But to suggest that our relation to God is a relation to One who is to stand surety for the attainment of human purposes, however noble and moral, is to invite "the error of kulturprotestantism in the next generation." And this was really what was happening in the latter Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries: Protestantism tended to become identified with the moral optimism of this period. The world, it was felt, is gradually attaining its moral maturity. Through the instrumentality of science and education a new day is dawning, ignorance being the one effectual hindrance to the free expression of the innate goodness of man, to the "revealing of the sons of God." Religion helps to tap these amazing resources in man, and, as such, lays its claim to the ultimate loyalty of men's hearts and minds. Thus, however unintentionally, the Protestant mentality was moving toward a "religion of man," a religion of ethics.

But two World Wars, a devastating depression, a Korean War, and an uneasy peace in a world equipped with weapons more deadly than the imagination dare conceive, make a religion accentuating the moral potentiality of the natural man seem strangely irrelevant. The cry today is not for greater faith in God-like qualities in man but for a fresh knowledge of the God of creation and history who is *not* man but in the light of whom man may come to realistic self-knowledge. The felt need is not for a reference within man whereby he may come to know and master the world, but first and foremost a reference to that Reality before which man must receive the verdict as to whether human existence itself, with all its irrationalities, cruelties, and threats of oblivion, does indeed have a meaning that transcends any human circumstance or any merely human hope or despair.

Such appears to be the basic context and temper within which so much discussion on the meaning of revelation is taking place

today. Without question the most significant single figure in recent theological thinking on this issue has been Karl Barth. This is not to say that Barth has given the definitive Christian answer to this difficult problem. On this there is a pronounced difference of opinion in Protestant Christendom. But on one thing there is a broad consensus of opinion in Protestant theological circles today, namely, that no living person has done quite so much as Karl Barth in awakening the contemporary Christian mind to its ambiguity and confusion on the matter of revelation, and in making clear that the uncertain voice of Christian witness at this point is intolerable in the presence of the malady that afflicts modern life.

Our concern here is not that of inquiring into any particular school's treatment of this issue, but rather to take note of what appears to be the basic perspective and main concerns characterizing the contemporary approach in general. What stands out as of first and foremost importance is the fact that contemporary Protestant thinking is becoming increasingly clear and articulate in its conception of the nature of revelation, as such. *Revelation is not a matter of "truths" communicated by means of propositional statements.* Or, to view the issue from the standpoint of human response, *faith is not* a matter of assent to a set of propositional truths bearing some kind of doctrinal or ecclesiastical authority. On the contrary, revelation (and faith) is an *event.* It is an event in the personal history of a given individual which becomes the center of trust, assurance, and commitment out of which, and in terms of which, this person lives, thinks, and acts. It is, in short, that action of God upon a human life that elicits the personal response of faith, faith not simply that God *is* but that "God is with us" (Immanuel), that we are His, and that the whole scope and meaning of our existence is grounded in Him. It is the central event in our personal history whereby we become aware of who we are, what we are, and wherein our destiny finds its meaning. Faith so conceived is not the end product of a process of reasoned argument, nor again the mere intellectual assent to what one be told is the assured truth in such matters. It is rather the response to an event (for the Christian, the event of God in Christ) that brings meaning, conviction, and personal assurance about the mystery of human existence, an event that illumines the context of one's total existence, that illumines all other events.

The term "event" is used to describe the fact of revelation for two reasons. First, it is a dynamic term, signifying not only that God does reach out to man in self-disclosure but also that revelation, in its true sense, involves human response as well as divine disclosure. This, also, emphasizes the view that revelation, essentially has not to do with a set of propositional truths to be believed, or a code of laws to be obeyed. Fundamentally, revelation has to do with a relation between *persons,* not between things, or things and persons. Human persons *know* one another only as they reveal their true selves in human relationships, and evoke from one another *personal responses.* So, too, in the relation between God and man. Revelation is an event in which God encounters man. Shall we say that it is the event in which man's ears are attuned to what God has to say to him, where man recognizes and responds to God's self-disclosure to him in the person, Jesus Christ. The point is that there is revelation, in the true sense, only where there is both an act on God's part and a response on man's. Thus the word "event" to capture the dynamic—and personal—character of revelation.

But the term "event" is of crucial significance in this connection for still another reason. It signifies not only the dynamic character of revelation but its contemporaneousness. The encounter with God's disclosure in Jesus Christ, and the new relation

with God established thereby, is an encounter not primarily with the disclosure of God's grace on a Cross two thousand years ago; rather it is an encounter with the redeeming mercy of God in the living, risen, Christ who effects a new center and a new love in every present moment in man's existence.

If this way of stating the matter seems to be highly mystical, if not mystifying, it is primarily because it is always difficult to deal with a "living relationship" in terms of words. The reason so much current theological discussion is couched in this language is because it is felt that we must learn once again what Paul, Augustine, Luther, and others were saying and testifying to when they affirmed a new relationship with God through a personal confrontation with the living Christ. Reduced to its simplest terms it is an attempt to say that we really hear what God has spoken, and is speaking, to us through Christ not by giving the assent of our minds to doctrinal affirmations about Christ, but rather as out of the very depths of our being, with all of its uncertainties and contradictions, we respond with our total lives to what God is saying in Christ. This is the event of revelation, the effecting of a new "center" in human life, that center being God. The revelatory event has two aspects: the act of God and the response in man.

But if doctrinal statements, or even the literal words of the Bible, are not themselves to be taken as revelation in the true sense of the term, then what is their rightful status? Whatever else may be said, it is certainly not the temper of the contemporary Protestant mind to say that these treasures of the Christian community represent the mere human opinion of a given time and place about the meaning and implications of the Christian Gospel. To be sure, there is truth in such a statement, but it is a dangerous half-truth unless properly qualified. Must it not be said then more after this fashion: all propositional statements about the meaning of the Gospel, whether they be doctrinal treatises, creedal statements, or the "words" of Scripture itself, represent the attempt of Faith to articulate itself in communicable form? In and of themselves they are not revelation; nor is simple assent to them however honest, genuine faith. What the Biblical writers were doing was not "writing revelation," but rather giving testimony to revelation. Revelation could not be "written," even by a St. Paul; but what a St. Paul could do was to testify to his personal encounter with God in Jesus Christ, and testify with a power and conviction that few, if any, have ever been able to match. So, too, the doctrinal affirmations of Christendom at large, and of the various denominations in particular, are not revelation. Rather, they are, on the one hand, testimony to revelation, and, on the other, a consecrated attempt on the part of the Christian community or parts of the Christian community to understand more fully the meaning of the faith which it affirms.

So we come back again to St. Augustine's perspective on the relation of faith and reason. Faith precedes understanding, says Augustine in effect, therefore believe in order that you may know. In other words, human reason, as such, does not lead man to the revelatory event, but the revelatory event provides the context within which reason exercises its powers. All reasoning operates within some basic context, in terms of some initial assumptions which are both unproved and unprovable. And it is in terms of this fundamental orientation that various systems of thought arise. The Marxist has his basic assumptions, the Humanist has his, and so for all the schools of thought that ever existed. So too, in all these instances, reason does not establish the assumptions (a contradiction in terms) but rather seeks to elucidate the meaning of life in its various ramifications in terms of these assumptions. But it is distinctive of Christianity,

when it is true to itself, to acknowledge quite frankly that it is grounded in faith assumptions, indeed to glory in the particular faith in which it *is* grounded. Moreover, it is also ingredient to the Christian mentality to recognize that the *reason* which it brings to bear upon its faith orientation is a "converted" reason. This is to say that it is a reason that no longer is under the illusion that it is a law unto itself, qualified by nothing outside its own logical relations. The "converted" reason knows (so long as it continues in the "state of grace") that it operates in the service of faith, and that it has a noble but subject role in the fulfilling of this function.

Augustine said, "Believe that you may understand," and his own life stood as a living testimony to the integrity of this position in his thought. Tossed to and fro before his conversion by virtually every wind of doctrine the ancient world could produce, Augustine was distraught and miserable. Whatever many of us must confess as to the limitations and failures of our Christian commitment, Augustine's encounter with God through the eyes of Christian faith brought about an amazing transformation in his total life. The unruly pieces of his formerly fragmented life now fell into a meaningful pattern, a pattern from which he derived moral strength as well as new creative horizons of the human mind of which he had never dreamed before. *Faith brought him understanding.* It brought a release of the powers of the mind; the mind found a new freedom because it had found a new master, one indeed in whose service was perfect freedom. Is this anti-intellectualism, irrationalism? By no means! It represents rather a converted reason, a reason that found itself because it had been constrained to lose itself.

Such also, with whatever variations among individual and respective traditions, appears to the present writer to be the main drift of current Protestant thought on the relation of revelation and reason.

IV. THE THEOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE

By Fred D. Gealy

THE THEOLOGICAL approach to the interpretation of the Bible is, of course not new. How could it be since the Biblical religion is a dialogue between God and men, between God and the nations, between God and *the* nation, his people Israel, Old or New? "I have somewhat to say to thee" may characteristically represent God's address to man. Nor did man always reply, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth," nor yet, "Be it unto me as Thou wilt." Much more likely, rebelliously, would he say, "Show me wherefore thou contendest with me," or even, "Are not my days few? Cease, then, and let me alone?" Or even, "Why is my pain perpetual and my wound incurable? Wilt thou be unto me as a liar, and as waters that fail?" . . . "O Lord, thou hast deceived me." And dare we utter or leave unuttered the ultimate: "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?" which is, being interpreted, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And does not the entire history of the interpretation of the Bible reflect man's historic contention with God and his concern to know what his God requires of him, so that, it may be, God will accept him and redeem him from all his ills? The difference between the upright and the wicked in the Bible is not that the wicked blaspheme and the upright do not: both blaspheme, but the upright, even

while they contend with God, will not let Him go. With Thee all night I mean to stay and wrestle till the break of day. I will not let Thee go, except Thou bless me. Obviously, a theological concern has always been primary in the Christian appeal to the Scriptures.

And yet, in an important sense, it is true that what we mean today by the "theological approach" to the interpretation of the Bible refers to a movement hardly more than forty years old. This means that all persons educated in our higher schools between, say, 1875 and 1930, not to push the dates farther apart in both directions, have been trained to a perspective in Biblical study developed and perfected in and therefore characteristic of the latter half of the Nineteenth Century and the first quarter of the Twentieth. It is therefore not surprising that there remain among us a considerable number of persons whose orientation in Biblical studies faces towards the Nineteenth Century rather than towards the Twentieth. That is to say, they represent a point of view which might be designated as "Biblical science," or "Biblical history," in contrast to "Biblical theology."

This does not mean that the Nineteenth Century was unconcerned with theology in the Bible. Witness for example such important and widely read studies as A. B. Davidson's *The Theology of the Old Testament,* published posthumously in 1904; G. B. Stevens' *The Theology of the New Testament,* 1899; and the massive standard text of H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie,* 1897, issued in a revised edition in 1911 by those German giants, Adolf Juelicher and Walter Bauer. Nevertheless, it will not be disputed that the perspectives governing these studies are radically different from the theological approach which in our time is rising to rapid dominance.

In 1928 a theological student from Germany asked a distinguished British New Testament scholar resident in one of our metropolitan seminaries, "Have you read Barth's *Romans?*" This scholar had significantly served the Anglo-Saxon community by transmitting to it with skill and enthusiasm the viewpoints of German liberal criticism, particularly with reference to the Fourth Gospel. The reply was, in effect, "When the book came out, I picked it up, read a few pages, saw that it wasn't what I wanted, and never finished it." This remark may be taken to indicate the difference in the climate of Biblical criticism then and now. For whatever one may think of Barth as such, his name has become a symbol of a movement which has leaped beyond his intent or control and which cannot now be ingnored. He has started fires which will not soon burn out.

The purpose of this article is to state the dominant concerns of Nineteenth Century Biblical criticism; to show how the very assiduity and success with which they were pursued revealed the inadequacy of the basic assumptions and presuppositions within which they were conducted; and how this precipitated a new perspective, which, if it can be protected from the peculiar perils which pertain to its own special angle of vision, promises a new era of religious fruitfulness. As Paul S. Minear has written, "Biblical studies are today in the midst of a vast, exciting, unpredictable transition. No one can yet discern the shape of a newer methodology, but we may be sure that changes will be both subtle and far-reaching. ("Christian Eschatalogy and Historical Methodology" in *New Testamentliche Studien fuer Rudolph Baltman,* 1954, *p.* 20.)

Albert Schweitzer begins his survey of the Life-of-Jesus-Research, 1906, 1913, with the work of Reimarus (died 1768), about whom his first statement is, "Before Reimarus no one had attempted to interpret the Life of Jesus historically." In the use of the word "historically" Schweitzer not only reveals the perspective of Reimarus in 1768

but of himself in 1906 and of the whole of the Nineteenth Century and more. The primary concern, whether in Old or New Testament, was to discover the historical events as they actually happened but lay concealed beneath fragmentary, often legendary narratives, themselves totally unaware of the methods or concerns of Nineteenth Century historical science and indifferent to historical values as conceived by Nineteenth Century historians.

To the pursuit of this exciting but elusive goal a vast amount of energy, mental acumen, and brilliant if sometimes erratic imagination were devoted. The result was an enormous acquisition and accumulation of knowledge extending over almost every area of human interest. Here we need only to refer to the minute and comprehensive investigations in physical geography and geology; in ancient ethnography; in archaeology and cultural anthropology; in the political, economic, and cultural history of the entire ancient and Near Eastern peoples and areas; in the languages, their discovery, decipherment, analysis, the production of historical lexicons, or comparative grammars; in the classification of texts and establishment of procedures of textual criticism; in the study of the rich variety of literary forms in which events and ideas were set forth in the ancient world; and finally in the History-of-Religions-School, in the data of myth and in the origin and meaning of mythological thinking. The hope which provided motivation for this effort was that there might be established so extensive a contextual mass of myth, rite, and idea, that the Bible could be fully explained out of Near Eastern history and without any missing links; that a sure account of the chronological and ideological development of religion in the Bible from the lowest to the highest forms might be given; and that by means of the new procedures for disinguishing between fact and interpretation, and for discovering the true cause-and-effect sequence, an objective account of the history of the Christian faith and church might be achieved.

This objective once achieved, an end seemed to be promised to man's ancient anguish. For, included in the faith-presuppositions of the period was the belief that once the "sure results" of historical investigation were arrived at this body of unprejudiced and objective data would constitute God's self-revelation to man, and would put us in a clear position to distinguish the essential from the non-essential, the eternal from the temporal, and would bring us out of the dark wood and into the clear white light of absolute truth. We should know what Christianity really is, in idea, in behavior pattern, in institutional form; and without too much distress we might find ourselves equipped to accept it.

However, the great Nineteenth Century increase in knowledge failed in many ways to produce the desired certainties. Some of its most dogmatically held presuppositions began to appear as functioning with ambiguity and foreboding. Since, for example, the evolutionary idea was being applied with great fervor to the interpretation and explanation of all data existent in the visible world, it became natural for students to suppose that if genetic questions could be solved, all other problems could be easily managed. The ambiguity of the genetic approach was brilliantly demonstrated only a generation ago when belief in this fallacy raised to such exaggerated and illicit importance the "missing link" idea for both churchman and non-churchman alike. Both believed that identification or discovery of "the missing link"—that is, of an observed cause-and-effect relationship between all existents—would render religion superfluous. The non-churchman wanted it so and jumped quickly to the "monkey-theory"; the churchman wanted it not so and therefore frantically rejected the biological evidence, not because he had any special dislike for "monkeys" nor yet because he secret-

ly suspected he might be one, but because of the radical implications, as they were believed to be on both sides, of the genetic theory of explanation.

Furthermore, continued pursuit of the "historical" method of Biblical study seemed not to bring the goal nearer but to push it ever farther away, if not to make it a mirage. The more investigation the more disagreement; the more discovery the greater the variety: the old house had been torn down, but the builders could not now agree on how the foundations for the new one were to be laid or what the plans for the superstructure should be.

Of course most shocking of all were certain types of disillusionments which were precipitated with power by persons like Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer stated in unforgettably poignant words, repeated so often as not to need reprinting here, that when we discover the Jesus of history as he was we find he was not at all what we were looking for, and that he is a stranger and not for our time. Or the disillusionment which comes when we are told that the apostolic churches which we have been led to idealize are not fit for us to emulate. Or even when we are told that if a historian looks carefully enough into the sources he cannot find any "bare" facts of which he can be really certain, thus leaving us in a kind of suspended animation.

Obviously, then, as important and as beneficial as Nineteenth Century historical procedures were and are, there was something lacking, and something, indeed, of great, perhaps of primary importance. Hence, it is by way of reaction that the new theological approach to the Bible has been precipitated. Ideally, the new theological approach to the study of the Bible will not replace the old by radical displacement. All the historical sciences which were pursued with such intensity and fruitfulness must continue to be pursued and with equal fervor. We need to know both what we can know and what we cannot know. That is, where there are boundaries of knowledge, we need to know where they are if possible. There must also be continual reformulation of methods and aims of procedure. Both old and new questions must be asked. The theological approach must not be thought of as an easy way out of a difficult situation. "Faith" must not be thought of as a lazy man's effortless substitute for "works." There are different levels of concern, and all are important.

We may think, then, of the new theological approach to the Bible as both a return and an advance: a return in the sense that its primary concern is not with matters of secondary import, such as textual or lower criticism and with historical or higher criticism, but with the Bible as the book of narratives and events in which God has spoken and does speak. It is an advance in that it is fully certain that God cannot speak to us and to our generation richly and fully unless we are willing to pay the full price of entering into the problems of secondary import, that is, into the problems of lower and higher criticism and all the rest. We do not repudiate the Nineteenth Century as such any more than we do any other century.

What we try to make clear is that the impact of God upon man must not be limited to mediation through the thought forms of any one period in the development of human life and thought. This is to absolutize a relative, to kill life, and to relegate the Bible to the rubbish heap of antiquated thought structures. We insist that, as we read the Bible, what is of first importance is not what God said to Abraham. It is not even what God said to Jesus. Rather, it is what God is now saying to us. The most meaningful perspective from which I may study the Bible is not with a view to finding a solution to the problem of God as my problem, nor yet of myself as my problem, but of myself as God's problem. We may read the Bible to find God; the process is important only if God finds us.

V. THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By Charles H. Johnson

CHRISTIAN education has a distinctive and indispensable task to perform within the redemptive fellowship which is the context and structure determining the nature of its office. Its foremost ground principle is theistic in character, for it holds that all life, to be meaningful, is God-centered. This immediately separates it from those educational enterprises which are based on a non-theistic humanism, and which find within man's experience the only sources and criteria for the formation and judgment of human values. Since the entire program of Christian education has both religious and moral implications, and is characterized as "an act of love," [1] it is distinguished from all educational enterprises conceived as methods of "producing social adjustment or vocational skill or knowledge." Though Christian education does not exclude these purposes, it finds its chief aim rooted in foundations which provide a deeper meaning for life than is inherent in these other methods.

A method of existential analysis is presupposed in this paper, because Christian education is thought of as preparation for the reception of Christian answers to the deepest and most persistent questions that arise in human existence. This approach to Christian education is attentive to the most profound research of depth psychology, as well as to the analysis of classical theology, to help the individual become aware of the despair and ambiguities which beset him under the conditions of existence. Such awareness is a necessary step toward the final goal—that the individual find freedom and life through the creative love of God as the Source and Ground of Being itself.

It is assumed at the outset that everything done in the program of Christian education represents an attempt to prepare persons for a God-centered life, which alone is productive of the greatest possible fulfillment of the self through the Divine-human relationship. Fulfillment involves intellectual and emotional maturity, preparing the individual to assume responsibility and to function as a responsible member of a self-governing society. The concerns of Christian education are, then, knowledge about the world of nature and of human relationships, knowledge about recorded revelation, a personal life of fellowship with God, a genuinely Christian spirit and attitude toward personal goals and human relationships, the achievement of the richest life for the individual, and preparation for the largest service to others.

There are certain distinguishing features inherent in the method of existential analysis. First it should be pointed out that the method of existential analysis of the human situation is itself an educative function that is organic to any preparation which the self must undergo for the reception of Christian answers and the establishment of a living faith. This implies a process not only of *leading out,* but also of *leading toward* something which is *given.* In guiding the changes which take place in persons in their relationships with God, the Church, other persons, the physical world, and themselves, Christian education leads toward that which is an *existing reality.* Jesus Christ has come as the bearer of the *new reality.* This event cannot be erased from the historical context in which all experiences in the Church are rooted. This is the reality toward which Christian education leads, that "persons may be drawn into the kingdom of God, attain to closeness, liberation, wholeness, and individuality as persons in community; and sustain the relationships and responsibilities of life as children of God." [2] Such redemptive preparation makes possible the participation in the *new reality* which gives the power to take upon oneself anxiety

and despair and have them become the means to wisdom and the knowledge of life's deepest meaning.[3]

If Christian education is seriously considered for the reception of Christian answers to questions arising in the situation of the human self, then we must take account of both the objective and the subjective aspects of the method of existential analysis. Such preparation involves not only opening up to the learner a dimension of reality which is new to him, but also opening the heart of the learner to the meaning of this reality. Neither of these two functions is dependent solely upon the skill and method of him who ministers to the learner as teacher or priest. The leader so related to one standing in the dynamic field of relationship in which the deepest changes of the self occur, serves as one who is *transparent* between the revealing Self and him who is confronted by the Truth that can "set him free," if he is able to respond in faith. Nevertheless, these two sides (objective and subjective) of the redemptive enterprise of Christian education are involved, and the materials employed in the process must serve as potential media of revelation to relate the person to that which has the power to actualize his every potentiality. At this point, witnessing to that which God has done is one of the most effective means of communicating the Gospel. The witness of faith speaks to the condition of the human soul, to help make it ready and able to reach out with its questions to Him who stands constantly ready to answer.

Since the religious answers which impinge upon the human situation in a corrective and transforming way center primarily in truth as revealed in a Person, the analysis of this Truth must follow a symbolical rather than a definitional approach. God is the "Subject" of our ultimate concern, and He has chosen to reveal Himself most significantly at the human level through the Person of Jesus Christ. All that can be said about the Nature of God in this revealing event must be said in symbolical form. Here the human mind, in its relationship with the Divine Mind, throws out symbols which represent the character of the Divine-human relationship and those involved in it. These symbols of faith lend themselves as expressions and media of the learning enterprise, as means of communication, when learning is considered in terms of dynamic relationship between and among persons, both human and Divine. The dialectic of learning becomes a matter of question-answer dialogue in which symbols attempt to lay hold of the deeper meaning of the encounter. These symbols must be either accepted and participated in, or struggled with and set aside in order to create and participate in more adequate symbols. Thus do the symbols representing one's discovery of the deeper meanings of the Divine-human encounter provide for another person the potential answer to his most basic questions and needs, or else they serve as the provocative instrument for making him raise questions of the area of reality here revealed. It is at this point that the "leading out" as well as the "imparting" function of the educational relationship in the Christian faith community is seen to be operative.

Another distinguishing feature of the method of existential analysis, when applied to the field of Christian education, lies in the proposition that every existential question actually involves an answer that is presupposed. The whole meaning of revelation as the correlative movement of a Self toward the questioning self who asks concerning the nature and meaning of his being, is caught up in this proposition. Under the conditions of existence, man's reason is seen as ambiguous; it needs revelation for its completion and fulfillment. The message of revelation, presupposed in the essential questions arising in the human situation, is received, collected and interpreted through the medium of experience, but it is not created by experience. Man through reason can understand reality only because reality is

itself understandable. Reception and revelation are then to be understood as two movements always operative in man's learning process, penetrating into the very depths of essential nature and giving it a structure. In every act of reasonable reception and reaction, we transform reality according to the way we see it, and we see it because we rereceive it and react to it. Thus is there a direct correlation and correspondence between the questions raised in the human scene and the answers revealed in the nature of God, as Being itself.

One other distinctive feature of the approach to Christian education which employs a method of existential analysis follows from these other propositions: namely, that man's problems can never be solved within the problematic situation itself. They must always find answers in symbols which are outside the existential scene. Much of the quarrel with progressive education, so evident in the newer theological reorientation, lies right at this point. Paul Tillich speaks within this position when he deplores the attitude of much of progressive education "to rely on the natural creativity of every child, so that it may achieve maturity being liberated from artificial restrictions." [4] He insists that "there is not such natural creativity in the isolated individual," and that "he cannot produce the content and the norms according to which he has to live, in which and through which alone he can become creative instead of falling into arbitrariness on the one hand and a compulsory dependence on the other." [5] His *good* is that which is done by God. And since God can be known only through revelation, the *good* is that which is initiated within God's Self-disclosure. In contradistinction to any view that places the will of man as the foundation of moral law, it is affirmed in this position that an adequate solution to any of man's deepest needs and questions is to be found only in the Christian view of man which recognizes revelation as its ground principle. Man's deepest questions and needs must have their answers in terms of symbols of faith which are outside the existential scene. Consistent with the biblical view, Christian education must maintain that reason cannot be depended upon to give authoritative direction in the moral struggle of life under the conditions of existence. Answers to man's questions in this struggle are wholly dependent upon an authoritative *event* in which a *given* element produces within man that which he cannot otherwise have. In this event, God is the Initiator and the Creator upon whom all spiritual growth depends.

Without qualification it can be maintained, therefore, that Christian education has its nature and function determined and defined for it by the faith community in which it occurs, and from which it derives its content. Christ's living presence in the Church constantly confronts persons with the truth about Himself, which has the power to set life free from the ambiguities which beset it, and to bring that unity and purposefulness to life which give peace in the midst of perplexity. To bring persons of all ages into a living fellowship with Him is then the underlying purpose of all Christian education. This we believe to be possible only within the redemptive community which is the embodiment of the Spirit of Him who confronts each person at every moment of his life, and concerning whom he must ever make a decision of acceptance or rejection.

As one of the offices of the Christian faith community, along with such others as worship, preaching, administration, pastoral care, and Christian outreach, Christian education can be thought of as guidance with respect to changes occurring within persons caught up in a dynamic field of relationships, both human and Divine. It involves a process in which one meets himself with an ever-changing degree of self-understanding, that he may also find a more realistic and wholesome form of self-expression, leading to self-transformation which indi-

cates genuine growth in knowledge and grace. It is therefore proper to think of the end sought in Christian education as drawing persons into the kingdom of God, conceived as a continual action of God in history, through Christ—this to the further end that they may attain closeness, liberation, wholeness, and individuality as persons in community and may sustain the relationships and responsibilities of life as children of God. The aims of Christian education must constantly be understood and interpreted in the light of the inner structure of the Christian faith as related to the most profound questions and problems of a given time and place. When we attempt to ascertain the major task of Christian education, we see it as a two-way current of education and impartation in those relationships in which we aim at discovering and imparting the relevance of Christian truth.

The means to the ends desired in Christian education are varied, including such steps as (1) introducing persons to the Christian community, (2) introducing them to the Bible and the Christian heritage, (3) preparing the way for personal response to revelation, (4) participating with them in purposeful action, and (5) counseling with them during occasions of crisis. In actual structuring of the program of Christian education, no one of these means should be lifted to greater prominence than the others.[6] However, the Bible when properly understood, is the major source of all Christian teaching. We cannot apprehend the essentials of the Christian faith and life apart from the biblical witness as our authoritative source. It must also be recognized that "we cannot apprehend the Bible as such a source and norm, still less rightly use it, apart from a living participation in the Church's faith and life . . . because the Bible, in its function as norm, and the church's faith and life are organically one, and form a single, indivisible whole."[7]

Even as the chief source of Christian teaching is the biblical witness to revelation, we must further assert that the chief interest of our teaching is the learner. This is in keeping with the very nature of the Church, in which the educational relation is thought of as an "act of creative love." The love of God which is *agape* lies behind the entire process in which the redemptive act occurs. His love lies behind His act of creation, even as His Spirit seeks to heal and fulfill all that He has created. Our genuine concern for the learner in the educational relation that is truly Christian is best seen when the child is accepted as genuine partner in the communion of *agape*. This is both needed and demanded if personal relationships in the educational work of the Christian community are to serve as media of revelation and be productive of real educational change. We are thus led to conclude that the chief end of our teaching is the ever enlarging of that community of faith which represents the triumph of creative love, as the very Spirit and work of the God and Father of Jesus Christ.

To conceive the nature and function of Christian education within the theological framework of the Christian answer to the fundamental questions of human existence is to see Christian integration in terms of the relationship between God and man. The integration desired to bring to fulfillment the self structure of a person is the direct result of this relationship. The religious adjustment here involved is basic to the entire process of living, for it involves the whole personality in relation to God. Thus the primary factor in the educational relation is something which is not manipulated or controlled by the process itself. It comes as a sheer gift of the grace of God, as primary Subject in the relationship of redemption. In any theological approach to Christian education, it must be recognized that faith in God, as revealed in Jesus Christ as Lord, is finally not under the con-

trol of him who purposes to function as the educator in the religious enterprise. The educational function of the Christian faith community therefore closely approximates its function in evangelism. Its task is that of confronting persons with Jesus Christ, and so preparing them to trust God through him, that they may receive the power of the Holy Spirit to live in commitment to God, sustained in their faith through the fellowship of the redemptive community.

Such a theological approach to Christian education does not involve a content-centered curriculum as an end in itself, nor does it support any form of authoritarian indoctrination. Rather does it urge toward such rediscovery of the relevance of revelation to the human situation, as will recognize the persistent needs of the human creature in terms of the questions with which he reaches out to grasp those dependable truths of religion which will satisfy and fulfill the deepest longings of his being. Within this context of dynamic Divine-human relationship, the gap between content and method in Christian education may be closed. Thus are we lead to describe the nature and function of Christian education as an enterprise within the Christian faith community. Because Christian education is uniquely concerned with communication between selves, both human and Divine, a dimension of relationship is involved in which the affirmation of the participating selves is a necessary concomitant to the changes that occur. The result of the Christian educational relation is then not merely growth, but rather a radical transformation of a creative and redemptive nature. This, in turn, becomes the basis for the courage and assurance necessary to face the ambiguities of human existence with the affirmation, "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

1Paul Tillich, "Creative Love in Education," **World Christian Education,** Vol IV, No. 2, 1949.
2Lewis J. Sherrill and Charles H. Johnson, **Basic Considerations,** Part I, p. 6. (A syllabus prepared for use in Religious Education 103 at Union Theological Seminary.)
3Paul Tillich, "Communicating the Gospel," **Union Seminary Quarterly Review,** Vol. VII, No. 4, June, 1952.
4Tillich, "Creative Love in Education."
5Ibid.
6Sherrill and Johnson, **Basic Considerations,** Part I, p. 7.
7Herbert Farmer, "The Bible: Its Significance and Authority," **The Interpreters Bible,** Vol 1, p 5.

VI. CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL CONCERN IN PREACHING

By Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.

THERE ALWAYS IS a gap between the theology of practicing theologians and the sermon-content of journeyman preachers. We usually think of "contemporary theology," which is the work of practicing theologians, as the leading edge of insight into Christian thought in our time in history. The "contemporary theology" of any day is associated with a dozen or fewer highly visible theologians, several score interpreters and modifiers of their thought, and eventually, the schools of theological thought that ensue from their controversies and elaborations.

It takes several years for a "new theology" to grow to "impact strength" in the seminaries, and then several years longer for the student preachers to relay it through the pulpit to the people. Along the way, the new theology undergoes corrections and adjustments at the hands of the teaching interpreters and the students. The students, upon becoming parish preachers, make further accomodations of the new theology to the specific situations in which they find themselves. While all of this is going on, other responses are being made to the new theology by preachers who are long out of seminary and by those who have never at-

tended a seminary. Some who always study vigorously make as much of the new theology as do the seminarians. Some ignore it. Some directly resist it. Some are mildly affected by it, either positively or negatively. So the gap between contemporary theology and contemporary preaching is not simply time-lag. In addition to the time-lag factor, there are those of deliberate modification in content, accommodation in situation, direct opposition, unawareness, and mild response.

Our immediate interest is in the preaching that is favorably aware of the mainline contemporary theological concern. We remember, however, that other types of preaching are present with us. While we may be tempted to discount all theology and all preaching except that which we believe and do, we need to be as critically fair as possible in evaluating the ideas and practices which differ from our own. We thereby often discover that we have company in unsuspected number in the cause of resisting Baal. We sometimes cannot agree entirely with the strategy used by our allies in faith, or, for that matter, with their opinion as to where the crucial battle should be fought. And now and again we think that we can identify some unwitting spokesmen for Baal in their ranks. Even so, they are neither all nor altogether wrong, and we must be as ready to affirm our points of common faith as to specify our differences. A brief summary of some of the current types of preaching with their implicit theologies will indicate the dual relationship of affirmation-rejection in which we necessarily stand to preaching other than that which engages us.

1. *Social responsibility preaching, or service-to-mankind exhortation.*

Social responsibility preaching is a continuation of the real greatness of our social gospel heritage, recognizing the fatherhood of God as the basis for the corporate as well as personal nature of human responsibility.

The frequent substitute for social responsibility preaching is service-to-man exhorting. It emphasizes the brotherhood of men without meaningful reference to God and is essentially an optimistic "uplift philosophy" which can be expounded and effectuated by civic clubs more appropriately than by the Church.

2. *Personal religion preaching, or idealistic moralizing.*

The human-problem approach which finds solution to personal identity and action in terms of relationship to God in all relationships is of help to most of us.

The distorted substitute for this preaching concentrates on ideals of human virtue and conduct which are extracted and separated from the context of faith, the people are arraigned for "falling short," and the solution that is urged is that they resolve more firmly and try much harder to "measure up." This probably is the most prevalent preaching that we have. Its nature is that of secular moral philosophy despite the use of "Christian ideals." There is no sense of the present grace of God in this preaching, and therefore no Gospel.

3. *Spiritual resources preaching, or sentimental neo-magic.*

God's enabling of men who trust in Him and desire only to obey Him is essential in any preaching that proposes to witness to the Gospel.

The current substitute is the recounting of the success story which reveals how men can "tap the spiritual resources" by prayer and meditational exercises so as to empower them to gain their self-determined ends and to enjoy them in peace of mind. The motivation is only slightly obscured by the sentimentality that envelopes the recounting. Despite

the Christian terminology that is used, this is the twentieth century version of magic—the effort to coerce the "higher powers" to do the will of men. It is far from religion that seeks God's terms for both ends and means.

4. *"Church Militant in action" preaching, or program, project and movement leading.*

The witness of the Church as a social force by influence upon government and secular organizations, and as an independent agent in education, home and foreign missions, medical and relief work, properly is supported from the pulpit and rightly commands the loyalty of Church members.

The witness of the Church cast as a series of programs, projects, and movements, without their being necessary expressions of the community of faith, secures the enthusiastic support of the minority of natural-born "projectors" and the impressed loyalty of the patient many. Services that should be worship become sessions for strategy-briefing, pep-talks, and the coercing of the diffident.

5. *Doctrinal preaching, or defensive dogmatizing.*

Doctrinal preaching which appreciatively reveals the roots of our faith anchored deep in the history of Christian thought and living helps to establish the basis for present religious authority and to enliven our contemporary Christian witness.

Doctrinal preaching which springs from an anxious and weak present faith, which finds security only in the past, is defensive and dogmatic. Men are encouraged to depend upon a formal faith, are taught to feel that those who differ from them are not their brothers, and are incidentally led to live as if God *was* but *is not.*

6. *Communicating the Gospel through personality, or preaching oneself.*

The man who is alive in the Gospel is the man who preaches. He is intent upon the Word and the people who respond to the Word. Undoubtedly the Gospel *is* communicated through the personality of preachers who are completely given to their calling.

The man who by any cause—personal ambition, personal esteem, forfeited self-discipline — preaches so that his preaching serves him, is not preaching the Gospel but is demonstrating the need for the Gospel in judgment. The content of his sermons is likely to be that which reveals his cleverness, his "goodness," or his "safeness" without offending the hearers. On the other hand, if he is one who must prove himself by dominating or by heroics, the content of his sermons is likely to be calculatedly different and deliberately offensive so as to demonstrate his "independence" and "courage." In either instance, it is himself and not Christ that he preaches.

A major service of a new theology is to help us who already are deep in preaching to have the insight and grace to say both "yes" and "no" to what we are preaching. A new theology is a dynamic, converting-restoring principle rather than an original, substitute theological body. Strictly speaking, no new theology is *new.* Its real genius is in its finding effective ways of re-stating the permanent insights of our faith so as to make them pertinent to a new day in history. Often secular insights of a particular time are converted into the theology to form the distinctively characteristic point of view of that time.

The contemporary theological concern of this day is a revival of the Athanasian insight that salvation is of God and not of men. Athanasius did not originate the insight, of course, because it is the basic in-

sight of the Bible itself. But Athanasius did personify this "heart of all doctrines" during an embattled century, so that we recall his witness under the impact of our present renewed realization of our radical dependence upon God. The present revival naturally is not cast in fourth century terms. The vital insight is mediated through sixteen centuries of Christian life and thought, and its revival is informed by the total history represented by these centuries; so it is not at all simply the replaying of an old theme.

In addition to the marches and countermarches within the Christian faith that have gone into our present theological outlook, depth psychology has struck from outside the Christian faith, as well as having welled up within it. Depth psychology has become annealed with Christian doctrine in the crucible of a crucial time, so as to make our contemporary theological concern center on God's action and man's *total* response. This concern turns us about and makes us say "no" to the preaching of humanistic morality, to unilateral human spirituality, and to camouflaged self-affirmation. It helps us to see that we can say "yes" only to the preaching in which God whom we know through Jesus Christ is the ground of life and meaning. Contemporary theological concern brings us to say "no" to the preaching of an understanding of human life in terms of correct beliefs and formal faith, and to say "yes" to the preaching which understands life that has meaning in relationships, involving responses that are integrally faith and reason.

Along with its "dynamic critique" function, the contemporary theological concern brings with it as least four difference-making implications for contemporary preaching.

1. *A renewed importance of the Bible.*

Since God who acts is the center of our present theological awareness, it is not surprising that the Bible has taken again its key place of importance. Here it is that we have the unexpurgated account of God's action and man's response. Through it we are renewed in the understanding of our religious origin and history, and are stirred alive in our immediate response to God. This means that the preacher must know the Bible as he has not had to know it since the Reformation. He must know it as a Biblical theologian, because his work is to preach the Gospel to which the Scriptures witness. "How can he do so unless he has tried to ascertain what Scripture says in systematic and comprehensive fashion and then tried to set scripture in the light of the developed experience of the Church and after that tried to relate the message of the Gospel to the rest of human experience, setting it forth in coherent and fully articulated fashion and the whole time vigilantly scrutinizing his procedure lest he be surreptitiously inserting a word of man in place of the Word of God? Unless he has undertaken that discipline he has no more right than any other man to stand up before his fellows with the open Bible before him." (Daniel T. Jenkins, "A Message to Ministers About the Communication of the Gospel," THEOLOGY TODAY, July 1949 p. 182.)

2. *The spirit of preaching.*

There is a spirit of preaching that is implicit in contemporary theological concern. When men are preaching derivative doctrine — second-degree messages which center on man's response, or on principles of the Christian faith, rather than on God acting—it is rather easy to be dogmatic. But when the central awareness is of God, our dogmatism changes to confessional witnessing. In dealing with principles and laws, we are large in our mastery of them. In the presence of God, we are our true size, and we master nothing but depend upon God's enabling for everything. We testify, we

acknowledge, with the non-defensive openness of joyful gratitude that God has acted to establish this relationship with us — that this faith has been given to us and is the meaning-giving heart of our lives. And we know that our testimony is a witness among witnessings. Our certitude is in the joy of meaningfulness given, not in the defensiveness of knowledge or virtue achieved over against others.

3. *Understanding the living situation of our people.*

Contemporary theological concern sees response to the Gospel as living all the relationships of life in response to God. Belief is not faith save as it is lived. Religion is living, and the Gospel claims all of life. In one true sense, this Existentialism of contemporary theology is Twentieth Century Wesleyanism.

To preach this Gospel, the preacher must know his people in their daily life as they live it—the needs and desires that they consciously have now, and the needs and desires that they must come to have if they are to live in the joy of God's grace. The preacher must know the whole social, intellectual, political, and economic setting in which his people live. The preacher does not proclaim the Gospel in general, but he preaches the Gospel to specific people in specific situations. Conversion for many a man means getting past some barrier in daily living that keeps him in his world and out of God's Kingdom of Grace, and that barrier is not "sin in general." No amount of unenlightened sincerity on the part of the preacher can help a man whose problem requires understanding and interpretation more than broadside volleys of truth and exhortation. The Gospel is indeed the answer to all the problems that men have, but only when the Gospel gets to them. The preacher must know the Gospel, but he must also know to whom he is proclaiming the Gospel, where they are, and how to get there.

4. *The nature of the sermon.*

Another difference that the contemporary theological concern makes is in the nature of the sermon itself. The point of preaching is to proclaim the Gospel so that men may know God through Jesus Christ, and so may live. The content of the sermon is our concern, and all else is secondary. Style, structure, and delivery must serve the one purpose of proclaiming the Gospel. The message itself and the nature of the day in which we preach make it out of keeping to think of the sermon as "a work of art." We are not artists. We are messengers. How we say it is not the main point. It is *that* we say it so that it is *heard,* not admired. We are servant-witnesses with the essential message of all time to speak in this crucial time — that God is Sovereign Love who acts even now in Jesus Christ to save us.

CONTRIBUTORS

Albert C. Outler came to Perkins School of Theology from Yale Divinity School in 1951 after a distinguished professorship there. He is professor of theology, the author of *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message,* and a speaker in demand at many church functions . . . *Herndon Wagers* joined the faculty of Perkins last fall in the field of Philosophical Theology after teaching and serving as Dean of freshmen at Connceticut Wesleyan . . . *Fred D. Gealy* has distinguished himself at Perkins in many fields—music, missions, history of religion, New Testament — but is now giving full time to the field of New Testament and the direction of the Seminary Singers . . . *Charles H. Johnson* is a new addition to the Perkins faculty in Christian Education, having come from Union Theological Seminary and a pastorate in New York City last fall. He was formerly Minister of Education at First Methodist, Evanston, Illinois . . . *Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.* also joined the Perkins faculty last fall in the field of Homiletics, having been formerly President of Martin College, Pulaski, Tennessee.

QUADRANGLE NEWS

The first Conference on Theological Education in the Southwest was held at Perkins during the Thanksgiving Holidays with Dr. Richard Niebuhr and Dr. Daniel Day Williams as special resource leaders. Seminaries represented included Austin Presbyterian, Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest, Brite College of the Bible, Southwestern Baptist Seminary, Phillips University, and Perkins School of Theology. Professors Niebuhr and Williams are serving on a special evaluative committee for the American Association of Theological Schools. Professor Niebuhr was high in his praise of the curriculum adopted at Perkins a year ago.

Ministers' Week was enthusiastically attended as usual, with Bishop A. Frank Smith, Dr. George MacLeod, and Dr. Henry J. Cadbury as the three speakers. Various conference groups held meetings, among which was one of the Texas, Southwest Texas, and Rio Grande Conferences honoring Bishop Smith. Students now enrolled in Perkins presented Bishop Smith with a leather book jacket engraved with the name of the Fondren Lectures which he delivered.

During the last week in January a joint meeting of Chairmen and Registrars of the Boards of Ministerial Training of the South Central Jurisdiction and of the Admissions Committee of Perkins School of Theology was held on the Campus. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss how these two groups can work together more adequately in the recruiting and the selecting of men for the Methodist ministry. Significant beginnings were made in the direction of this closer cooperation which ought to be of mutual benefit. Those attending were: Central Kansas, Milton Holcomb; Central Texas, Morgan Garrett, (Perkins, 1951); Kansas, Robert Kendall; Little Rock, Robert O. Beck (1939); Fred Harrison (1928); Louisiana, Robert Crichlow; New Mexico, John Carpenter, John Klassen; North Arkansas, J. H. Hoggard; North Texas, Henry Mood (1934); L. G. Hagard; Northwest Texas, George Steinman (1927), Doyle Ragle (1943); Oklahoma, Wayne Coffin, Byron Cravens; Rio Grande, Alfredo Nanez (1932), Ben Hill (1933); St. Louis, C. E. Yoes; Southwest Missouri, Perry Rowland (1941); Southwest Texas, C. A. Greenwaldt (1941), Ennis Hill (1933); Texas, Nolan Vance (1935); Central Jurisdiction, Texas Conference, J. S. Scott, L. B. Felder; West Texas Conference, T. B. Echols.

One of the events which students' wives have come to look forward to is Community Day at Perkins. Held on March 29 this year, some seventy student wives participated in an all-day series of activities including lectures, discussions, and social activities. Dean Cuninggim was among those who participated in the program.

Junior College educators from various parts of the country gathered on the Perkins campus during the week of April 4 to discuss the relation of religion to the work of the Junior College. Leaders included Jesse P. Bogue, Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges; Ernest C. Colwell, Emory University; Albert C. Outler, Perkins; Clarence P. Shedd and Seymour Smith, of Yale Divinity School; and President Tate. It was supported by the Edward W. Hazen and the Danforth foundations.

Graduation Exercises for spring, 1955, will be conducted on May 30. The first term of summer school begins on June 7. (For further information about summer school see the back cover.)

ALUMNI NEWS

ALUMNI LUNCHEON

Approximately three hundred alumni and friends attended the annual luncheon on Wednesday of Ministers' Week, held at Highland Park Methodist Church. Nuel Crain (1933) *outgoing president, presided. A report on the* 1954 *Alumni Fund drive was made by Dr. Lewis Stuckey* (1916). *Dean Cuninggim reported on new developments at the School, and Sterling Wheeler* (*S.M.U.*, 1937), *new Vice-President of the University, spoke briefly.*

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year:
President: The Rev. Ethan Dodgen (1932), *Jonesboro, Ark.*
Vice-President: The Rev. Orbin Turner (1931), *El Paso, Texas*
Secretary: The Rev. Carroll McLaughlin (1949), *Topeka, Kan.*
Representative on Alumni Fund Council: Dr. Lewis N. Stuckey (1916), *Dallas, Texas*

The total amount paid into the Alumni Homiletics Fund for 1954, *Dr. Stuckey reported, came to* $2,295.00, *as contrasted with* $2,479.50 *for* 1953. *This is somewhat less than the School had included in its* 1954-55 *budget from the fund.*

ALUMNI NOTES

1921. *Bishop William C. Martin* has concluded his two-year term as President of the National Council of Churches. He was honored with a luncheon on January 6 as one of the highlights of the second annual meeting of the Texas Council of Churches in Fort Worth . . . *W. B. Slack,* District Superintendent of the Greenville District, North Texas Conference, conducted Holy Week Services for Urban Park Methodist Church, Dallas, where *Ed. T. Hayes* (1948) is in his first year as pastor.

1923. *The Rev. Horace W. Williams* left the United States January 19 for a four-months' fact-finding trip to mission fields in Europe, India, Africa, and the Pacific area. Williams is executive secretary of the Interboard Committee on Missionary Education, a joint department of the Methodist Board of Education, Nashville, and the Board of Missions, New York City. On his trip Williams will gather information about the work and needs of the 1,534 Methodist missionaries in foreign fields.

1924. *Hugh O. Isbell* was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity from Central College on November 13. He is pastor at Columbia, Missouri.

1925. *Bishop Paul E. Martin* conducted a "Week of Preparation" at Perkins School of Theology on March 8, 9, and 10, looking

forward to Holy Week Activities. Besides preaching in chapel, Bishop Martin met with smaller groups and conducted personal conferences.

1930. Denton, Texas, First Methodist, has recently purchased a new parsonage and has voted to air condition the church. *Philip W. Walker* is pastor.

1932. *Bishop Santi U. Barbieri,* one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches, made a tour of Texas in February and spoke in chapel at the school. Bishop Barbieri was re-elected as bishop by the Latin American Central Conference in 1953 . . . *Dr. R. F. Curl,* district superintendent of the San Antonio District, was re-elected president of the newly formed Texas Council of Churches.

1933. *L. B. Trone* received the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity degree from McMurry College.

1934. *Ben F. Lehmberg,* former member of the Texas Conference and now pastor at First Church, Colorado Springs, has been named a trustee of Iliff School of Theology at Denver.

1935. *Robert E. Goodrich, Jr.,* continues his work with television, with "The Pastor Calls" in its sixth year on KRLD-TV, Dallas. A new series of thirteen films has recently been released in "The Pastor" series, distributed by the National Council of Churches . . . The new sanctuary at First Methodist, Lubbock, Texas, was opened on March 6. Begun under the leadership of the late H. I. Robinson, it seats almost 1,500 and is Gothic in style. *J. Chess Lovern,* the present pastor, has announced additional plans for building in the near future . . . *R. F. Thornton,* Chaplain (Lt. Col.), is director of the Retreat Center in Korea, where chaplains come for a brief period of study, meditation, and prayer.

1941. *Jack Wilkes* is pastor of the Crown Heights Methodist Church, where building facilities are taxed to capacity by overflow crowds in church and church school.

1942. *Patrick Armstrong,* pastor at Weslaco, Texas, was among the 150 ministers and laymen from forty states who took part in the evangelistic crusade in Cuba, February 8-17 . . . *C. Shrum Burton,* pastor at St. Paul's Springfield, Missouri, has been elected president of the Alumni Association of Missouri State College of Springfield.

1943. Chaplain and Mrs. *David E. Spradling,* of the Naval Air Station, Oceana Virginia Beach, Virginia, announce the arrival of Paul Terrence, their third son, on January 9 . . . *Irving Smith,* University Church, Tulsa, was the principal speaker at a youth rally held in First Church, Abilene, on January 3.

1944. *John B. Holt,* who taught at Perkins last year, reports of the urgent needs of the work in the Philippines. "*Our needs* are few but urgent," he writes; "*tools* for reaching more people. That means funds for travel, radio broadcasts, literature, and a fellowship hall at Knox Church . . . " Ninety percent of the colleges in the Islands are located within reach of Knox Church, where Holt is a minister.

1945. *H. A. Hanke* served as director of a "Bible Land Tour" for the second year, which left Idlewild Airport, New York, on December 4. Covering some 15,000 miles by air and visiting ten countries, the high point of the tour was the Christmas service conducted in Shepherds' Field near Bethlehem.

1946. *Charles W. Garrett,* pastor of the Church in Panhandle, Texas, received the Ph. D. degree from New York University after having earned his B. A., B. D., and M. A. degrees from S. M. U.

1947. Jerry Winn was born on January 4 to the *Sidney Blackburns* of Dallas, this being their fifth son.

1948. *Norton Wey* is hoping for the completion of the Methodist Student Movement center in the Gold Star Building at Oklahoma City University where he is director of the M. S. M.

1950. *De L. Hickley* was among those who participated in the evangelistic mission in Cuba in February. He is pastor at Wetumka, Oklahoma.

1952. *Carl W. Stokes,* now Assistant Pastor, First Methodist, Tulsa, has recently completed a two year tour of duty as chaplain in the U. S. Navy, serving part of the time with the First Marine Division in Korea . . . *Richard Detweiler,* associate pastor at St. John's, St. Louis, is president of the Perkins Alumni in the St. Louis Conference.

1953. *Wayne Hoehns* is pastor of the Seymour-Promise City, Iowa, churches, with a major redecorating job being in progress at the Seymour Church . . . *Russell D. Harris* has been elected president of the Ministerial Association of Pittsburg, California, where he is pastor . . . *Eugene Cragg* reports two morning services at St. Paul's, Bryan, Texas . . . *Jim Rogers* is in the midst of building plans for the Wesley Foundation at Oklahoma University, where he is in his second year as director.

1954. *David Lowry* and his family were at Perkins recently, having been commissioned at the January meeting of the Board of Missions as missionary to Chile . . . *Don Barnes* has accepted a position as Minister of Education at First Church, Baton Rouge . . . The *Jene Millers,* of Barnsdale, Oklahoma, announce the birth of their second daughter, Karen Louise, on December 28.

IN MEMORIAM

WARREN JOHNSTON (1928)

December 24, 1954, at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where he was pastor of the First Methodist Church.

BOOK REVIEWS

FRED D. GEALY, *Editor*

DEAR CHARLES

By Wesley Shrader. New York and Dallas: The Macmillan Company, 1954. 109 *pp.* $2.50.

Here is delightful reading. But just about the time you sit back to enjoy the exposure of the foibles of other preachers, you yourself get hit right between the eyes. You'll smile, you'll say, "Amen!" and you'll quote it to your friends; but don't pick it up if you can't stand to be ashamed of yourself.

Shrader has taken the *Screwtape Letters* idea and applied it to the development of the minister. What makes for a successful pastorate? Professor Astute knows; and the answers are different from those of most of his colleagues on the seminary faculty. Astute ought to know, for he had three pastorates before he took up teaching, and he failed in all of them. And now his prize pupil of some years past is just about ready for his first big church. The book consists, then, of letters from Astute to Charles, giving the young man guidance as to how to achieve success.

Charles is going is to have a rip-snorting ministry if he follows Astute's advice. He will escape offense in manners and taste. For example, a little later Astute can give his "full sanction to . . . a new Packard or Cadillac. At the moment, however, anything more than a Dodge would be considered bad taste." Charles will overcome such weakness as to believe that the Federal Council—Astute's letters were only recently discovered, and it was still the Federal Council when he wrote—"may not be as bad as our leaders seem to think." Nonsense! It is "the literal incarnation of Satan"; and the path of success is to fight the Federal Council at every step. Charles will evangelize, and will make no bones about raiding rival congregations; for after all, "what is good business for General Motors is good business for the church." And the content of Charles's preaching will be "Peace of Mind" —"This new approach really does it!"

"One final word, Charles: keep humble. Humility is the mark of a great man . . . In the midst of many discouragements and losses, my own humility has been to me a source of satisfaction."

Wesley Shrader is the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Va. One may begin reading this piece of fiction simply by marveling at Shrader's temerity; but one will end by being a better minister himself.

Merrimon Cuninggim

THE SWORD AND THE CROSS

By Robert M. Grant. New York and Dallas: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 140 *pp.* $2.75.

We have in this small volume the fourth book from the pen of one of our most versatile, scholarly, and promising younger Christian writers. It covers the entire sweep of the history of the inter-actions of Roman administration and Christian citizenship in the setting that began with the early Republic and ended with the Edict of Toleration in 311 A.D. Although this is an immense field, already occupied by voluminous written sources, Dr. Grant, with the disarming effortlessness of assured competency, gathers together the essentials in a high distillation of fact and interpretation. His disciplined style of lucid English makes the reading of the three brief chapters a pleasure; while a thorough familiarity with the entire field permits a flexibility of narration that causes events hitherto thought far remote to seem contemporaneous and understandable. Reign by reign, the reader is led along the three centuries as the tragic drama unfolds. But he is not left in a maze, for the author has a thesis of interpretation which he follows throughout. It is this:

From its beginnings Rome rested on the favor of the Twelve Gods; so all foreign faiths must be both subversive and irrational, dangerous superstition. Slowly they might be naturalized, but always the old pattern would be called up in times of crisis. The Christians inherited this prejudice, plus the additional ones relating to the Jews, accentuated by Pilate's reports on the conspiracy for which Jesus was executed. But most of all the turning-point came at the end of the first century when under the goad of Domitian's cruelties a "fiery denunciation" of Roman life and rule was written in the Apocalypse of St. John, and uncovered by the police. This eventuated in Trajan's specific instructions to Pliny: "The Christians must be punished," and provided a stereotype for the official treatment of the church for all succeeding rulers, in case they deemed it necessary to enforce it.

The author feels that at that juncture (95 A.D.) a *modus vivendi* could have been found and two centuries of struggle and bloodshed avoided. Already, he would say, the Christians had made their basic adjustment of loyalty to the nation, and already the tests by others before the ancient gods, or even to the genius of the Emperor had become mere "archaisms" to the Romans themselves. Although Christians with their emphasis on Christ's second coming and by the terminology of the Lord's Supper rites did lay themselves open to the popular charge of political conspiracy and even of cannibalism, and though sexual immorality in their secret meetings was popularly believed to occur, the officials no longer thought these things to be true; or at least were ready for evidence of the innocence of the Christians. But the mischief had been done, and even though by the third century Christians did not differ from their Roman neighbors in the fundamental matters of ownership of property, of slave-holding, of military service, or of inter-marriage, yet the Roman authorities stubbornly and stupidly demanded tests "in Roman terms" while the accused could answer only "in Christian terms." Thus it all came down to a matter of failure of communication. Only at long last did the desperate Galerius Maximus issue the overdue Edict, and the struggle was ended. "Rome could recognize religious freedom, and distinguish between the Roman religion and the Roman state."

But, the reader must ask, was this what really happened? Was not the so-called Toleration a reluctant capitulation to greater strength, to be followed soon after by Constantine's displacing of the old deities by setting Christianity as the cornerstone of the Rome he was struggling to rebuild? The new state religion proved to be no more tolerant of its former enemies than they had been of it. Perhaps, seen from the perspective of an American writing today, it was Rome's "duty to provide authority with freedom . . . to refrain from entering into religious conflicts, . . . to maintain absolute indifference to religious questions," but such a nation-state of two thousand years ago was utterly undreamed of and unthinkable. Even today one searches in vain for more than a very few states that give so much as lip-service to such a voluntary restriction of their concerns, and of them not one has abdicated its final authority over the citizen who dissents. The dilemma of a powerful, responsible state in crisis requiring spiritual unity for safety, and of a Christian movement bringing the absolute rule of God into human affairs has its classic setting in the Roman Empire to be sure, but it still is bedevilling our world today. It is too facile a reading of history to think that tragedy could have been avoided merely by better communication. Martydom is indeed one pattern of tragedy. But "domestication" is another perhaps quite as great. Suffocation may be less painful than the lions, but just as final. It is not only in the Japan of yesterday or the Soviet states of today that Christians bend to the will of the larger society. In varying degrees the old dilemma presents itself to Christians in every nation, a dilemma still basically unresolved.

Charles Iglehart

THE TRANSCENDENT UNITY OF RELIGIONS

By Frithjof Schuon. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1954. 199 *pp.* $3.50.

It is the characteristic experience of al-

most every fair-minded student of the world's religions that his study induces the feeling that all religions, notwithstanding their great diversity of form, have a fundamental or ultimate unity. This is, in the first instance, a thrilling notion. In spite of the student's own bias or religious orientation, he feels ennobled by the thought of his spiritual kinship to devout souls everywhere. But this character of response also has a most tantalizing aspect. How is the unity of religions to be defined with any degree of preciseness? An almost infinite diversity is the most obvious characteristic of the world's religions. If there is an essential unity, it can be sensed more readily than it can be demonstrated.

Nevertheless recurrent intimations of the unity of religions continually force the recognition of this question as a valid intellectual problem. The fact that the matter ultimately is insoluble is insufficient reason for disdaining to wrestle with it, and, indeed, the challenge has not gone unheeded.

Definitions of the unity of religions have been attempted in connection with at least four major disciplines—social science, philosophy, theology, and metaphysics. In general, the *scientific* search for unity has been an effort to discover the basic factors in human life which account for the origin of religion and, latterly, to analyze the functional relation of religion to the whole of society. *Philosophical* attempts often have been based on the assumption that the essential unity of religions is to be found in their common core of noble ideals and moral injunctions, and that the true religion can be compounded, eclectically or synthetically, of these elements, which ultimately are independent of their diverse religious contexts. *Theological* bids to clarify the issue of unity have utilized variant forms of the doctrine of general revelation or the doctrine of universal grace, the usual result being that the natural or given unity of religions is declared to be valid but qualitatively inferior to the particular and unique revelation in Christ—an act which provides for a new and higher level on which to realize the religious unity of mankind in a common acknowledgement of the lordship of Christ. But it is particularly within the realm of *metaphysics* that the most elaborate effort has been made to define the unity of religions. *The Transcendent Unity of Religions* is a fairly typical example of this effort.

The author's basic assumption is that universal Truth, in the awareness of which all religions have been called into being, can be understood without distortion only by metaphysical means. Philosophy with its categories and theology with its dogmas involve the delimitation and adaptation of truth. By these means truth may be apprehended by the intelligence but not understood. Real understanding comes only by intuition.

Religious systems are characterized by exotericism—an irreducible creature-Creator dualism and a quest for individual salvation. This, according to Schuon, is the necessary and inevitable condition of popular religion, but it involves a basic fallacy, namely the attribution of absolute reality to this dualism; whereas, in actual fact, creatureliness is only illusory, for human reality is reducible to the Divine Reality. This is, of course, the old familiar monistic affirmation emerging. It comes forth fully in the author's statement that ultimate Reality is not a personal God but a Divine Impersonality. This is a matter understood always only by a few who possess a predisposition for metaphysical speculation, but the esotericism of these few is the link between unitary Truth and the diversity of religious forms, thus making available the transcendent dimension which alone can infuse new life into the exoteric side of religion.

While there is little that is startlingly new in this book, it is a well-written presentation of the metaphysical approach to the problem it highlights. But does it answer the problem? It is the opinion of the present reviewer that it does not, and furthermore, that it is a vain striving to attempt to define the essential unity of religions by any method that denies meaning to history and to the personality of God.

H. Neill McFarland

NOT MINDS ALONE

By Kenneth I. Brown. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 206 *pp.* $3.00.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND HIGHER EDUCATION

By Nels F. S. Ferre. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 251 *pp.* $3.00.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE CHAPLAINCY

By Seymour A. Smith. New York: Association Press, 1954. 180 *pp.* $3.75.

In recent years the field of religion in higher education has come to occupy the attention of both educators and churchmen to a degree far greater than was true in the first third of the century. First came a concern for the programs of religion on college campuses. Lately the interest has deepened to the point of examining the nature of higher education itself and of asking whether, to what extent, and in what ways, it is essentially a religious undertaking. These volumes are, in their different ways, the latest products of that inquiry.

To take them in the alphabetical order of their authors' names: *Not Minds Alone* is a discussion of what Kenneth Brown calls in his sub-title, "Some Frontiers of Christian Education." Writing with charm and vigor, he interspcrses his material with many quotations, illustrations, and stories; but though the style and format are unusual for the treatment of so serious a theme, the reader never loses the thread of his argument. And the argument is that education, to be true to its own nature, must be concerned with "not minds alone" but with whole men, with their hearts and souls, with their religious orientation.

Brown demonstrates the need for such a conviction, and reviews the mounting evidence that the need is being taken seriously. He analyses the roles of the student, the teacher, and the administrator, and speaks winningly of "The Way Ahead." To this reviewer the best sections of the book have to do with the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian teacher and the "Measure of a Christian College." For the first, he believes that the difference lies in five qualities: "the depth of respect for truth"; the degree of "respect for human personality"; the contagiousness of his teaching born of his "sense of vocation"; the recognition of the "need for philosophical orientation" of his subject-matter, whatever it is; and as a further step, "his endeavor to see his academic discipline religiously, that is, in the context and within the relationships of Christian faith and understanding, and the goal of the Christian community."

His discussion of "the religious vigor and the maturity of a college campus" is equally provocative. As difficult as it admittedly is to judge whether or not a college can claim to be Christian, Brown believes that "the following six pieces of possible evidence" are indicative: the "measures" of student conversation, of student campus life, of fundamental faculty assumptions, of administrative policies, of campus outreach, and of total campus impact. If one cannot really prove such matters, one can feel their pulse; and certainly a college can give them close and conscious attention.

Nels Ferre's book digs more deeply into the philosophical and theological issues which Brown's volume touches upon. As he conceives it, his "main task is to propose a relation between education and religion in terms of the Christian faith that protects the integrity of both, while also joining them organically for mutual discipline and service." Thus he explores the nature of education, of religion, and of Christianity, and approaches his analysis of the relationship between Christianity and higher education by way of discussing "God as Educator" and the process of "Learning from God." That this is the approach of a theologian rather than an educator Ferre would be the first to confess; but his claim that he is simply "making marginal notes on education from the point of view of a theologian" is too modest.

For the educator should feel thoroughly at home in, and profoundly stirred by, the chapters on "Community and Communication" and "Human Nature and Education." Following an analysis of these matters

Ferre takes up what has now come to be a familiar theme, the relationship between religious faith and the various disciplines and subject-matter areas of the curriculum. But he is not content, in discussing "Natural Science and the Social Sciences," "History, Art and Literature," and "Philosophy and Religion," merely to repeat the plea that all these subjects be taught from a "religious perspective." After recognizing that religion must be "willing to face the hottest fire of fact and thought—to learn humbly and honestly from science, the humanities, and philosophy," he summarizes: "But when religion has carefully consulted its partners, its own responsibility and privilege is to find the faith that can set free, the beauty that can satisfy the spirit, the truth big enough to use the world of fact for the common good and to stretch the mind strong."

What does this mean for higher education? In his concluding chapter, "The University and the World," Ferre pulls together the strings of his argument. The university "will fall short of its function unless it works with constructive objectivity in the central light of the meaning of existence." This calls not alone for the teaching of religion, for "in such teaching inheres the coherence of the curriculum"; it demands, further, that the university be religiously centered and motivated. "Higher education, in order to climb in the direction of its own summit, needs to become resolutely Christian." One is sorry that he stops at this point, and that the final chapter gives the impression of having been written hurriedly; for the book as a whole lays solid groundwork for challenging the modern university at its secular heart.

Seymour Smith's purpose is much less ambitious, but no less valuable a treatment of a more limited theme. He proposes to examine *The American College Chaplaincy* as a post of religious leadership that has sprung up in recent years and in colleges of all types across the country, as an effort to answer the demand that colleges become concerned about religion. His is the first full-scale survey of what the colleges have done in this respect, and it is an indispensable guide for anyone who is related to the problem of campus religious leadership.

After tracing the growth of the chaplaincy, Smith furnishes an analysis of the various roles which college chaplains are called upon to play. The volume's central chapters on the religious leader as "Preacher and Teacher," as "Director and Counselor," and in the light of "His Other Responsibilities," show conclusively that, though the chaplain has an enormously difficult and complex task, his potential influence is far-reaching and often decisive with respect to whether religion really comes to matter on the campus. "The chaplain stands beside the teacher of religion, the Christian association secretary, the church foundation director, the consecrated Christian professor, the religiously concerned administrator. And with them he serves in a partnership which may make religion increasingly meaningful to students and may transform higher education in the years ahead."

Such books as these will do their part, too.

Merrimon Cuninggim

A DEMOCRATIC MANIFESTO

By Samuel E. Stumpf. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1954. 168 *pp.* $2.75.

Professor Stumpf's subtitle is, "The Impact of Dynamic Christianity Upon Public Life and Government." Thus the whole thrust of this powerful little book is directed toward an examination of democracy's basic premises rather than merely its practices. These premises, he believes, are Christian in character; and this analysis, therefore, should have large appeal for ministers and all others who are concerned that Christianity be made relevant to the political and social scene.

But such a thesis is not unusual these days. Many voices are raised to suggest that, since democracy and Christianity have so much in common, then a democracy is automatically a Christian state, and the Church should bless the political order. This is not Stumpf's position. The relationship between democracy and Christianity, he maintains, is such as to jack democracy up to be aware

of and live according to its own Christian principles, rather than to lull democracy into an assumption of its own blessedness. Democracy is a faith, and only as it recovers a sense of the truth and power of its basic articles of faith will it be able to compete successfully against communism.

The heart of Stumpf's volume is a treatment of three major elements in the democratic faith, and of the rootage of those propositions in Christian thought and experience. These three are: 1) a realistic view of man which emphasises both his "dignity" and his "recalcitrant character"; 2) a belief in the "supremacy of law"; and 3) a recognition that democracy is essentially "a moral enterprise." These three realizations are necessary to the sound functioning of a democracy, and more, to a sound understanding of what a democracy is all about. And these three are grounded most powerfully in Christian faith. They call for some gripping motivation; and such motives as fear, self-interest, and desire for security, to which communism appeals, and which are sometimes offered as the lures of democracy, are insufficient. Only the Christian motivation of love is adequate, and it is adequate because it is true to the nature of man and of God.

Here, then, is a voice that deserves to be heard. Stumpf has written a volume that will prove useful to any minister who is eager to understand why Christianity can never lend its blessing to communist ideas, and further, on what grounds Christianity can be properly related to democracy.

Merrimon Cuninggim

EVANGELICAL NONCONFORMISTS AND HIGHER CRITICISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By Willis B. Glover. London: Independent Press, 1954. 296 *pp.* 17*s.* 6*d.* ($2.45 *U.S.*)

This book will be of particular interest to our University community inasmuch as Professor Glover is a member of the history faculty. And while many of his friends will protest that my surprise was needless, honesty compels me to report that I had not expected such an excellently written, judicious, and delightful-to-read book. The compliment is not altogether left-handed, for I expected him to do a good piece of work in any case; the matter of fact is that the book is really first-rate in every way.

Mr. Glover apologizes for the necessity to limit his field arbitrarily in the manner the title indicates, but the book gives no such feeling of limitation. The contribution of Anglican scholars is continually discussed and described, and the date limitation scarcely hinders him in any way as regards Old Testament criticism, for the deed was done by 1900. The date does, on the other hand, virtually exclude New Testament criticism, for the serious attack in that direction in Great Britain only began at the turn of the century; while the astonishing work of the Cambridge Trio in defense of a conservative New Testament criticism was Anglican (nevertheless treated in Glover's study).

Several interesting things of general concern emerge from the book. One is the unusual speed with which the transition from open hostility toward every form of higher criticism bearing the name to a general acceptance of the method was accomplished; the period was about twenty years, from 1880 to 1900. Prior to 1880, the whole movement was associated with infidelity in general, with rationalism (meaning non-supernaturalism!), and with "Germanism." (This applies to Great Britain only, the region considered in the book. The situation in America was both more advanced and more reactionary.) For about seven years thereafter, the method was steadily accepted by many leaders; and then from about 1887 on, the growth of higher criticism was phenomenal. What accounts for this speed? The answer is related to another matter of general interest.

On the whole, higher criticism was utterly repudiated in England so long as it was associated with unorthodox theology and with naturalism. But as soon as native Britishers whose orthodoxy was unquestioned took it up, acceptance followed quickly. This suggests what is already known from general experience—that it is not the merits of a viewpoint which dispose men

to accept or reject it, but the attitude toward the man who proposes the viewpoint. Let the churches be persuaded that the exponent of criticism is an evangelical Christian, and objections dissolve. And this is natural enough, for otherwise the critical method appears as a threat against Christianity itself. There might be a lesson here for pastors.

Another interesting point is that the climate of thought in the Nineteenth Century was so thoroughly different from that in the eighteenth that defenders of the traditional viewpoint became just that—defensive, and had no choice about it. A century earlier, the critics of Biblical inerrancy had the onus of proof on them; now, the "historical" outlook had so changed things that traditionalists were obliged to utilize historical techniques of the same sort as their opponents', in order to do battle with them. Historical method was "in the air," and its use by defenders of the traditional viewpoint not only doomed them, but was inevitable.

Finally, despite the immediate deleterious effects of higher criticism on the religious fervor of the churches, it becomes quite clear that the long-run effects were not only good but were necessary for the survival of the faith in the twentieth century. Christianity and general intellectual life were beginning to discover a mighty barrier between them, and higher criticism was significant in assaulting that wall. Fearful as the church might be of bad influence coming from the destruction of that barrier, it would be impossible for her to speak to the world as long as it stood.

Some criticism is in order, lest I seem to be selling the book too unreservedly. Let me single out a matter which crops up often, and appears also quite frequently as an unacknowledged axiom of some contemporary British writing. It is the view (expressed succinctly on pages 66f.) that somehow the critical method and liberalism led to a dead-end in Gospel study, and that recovery was possible only by going back to the earlier evangelical viewpoint. Now it is certainly true that the liberal "quest" for the "historical Jesus," an untheological biography, was a vain one. But it is too late to deplore the search; not only have the liberals been whipping boys long enough, but it is simply untrue that the present position is similar to the pre-liberal evangelical one.

The evangelicals did *not* share the same theological perspective that the New Testament writers held; as the liberal criticism showed clearly, the conservative position was one which repeated the Biblical language in an alien context, with the result that the meaning was radically altered. (This is presently being put plainly by Bultmann.) For instance, the supernatural character of the narratives from the beginning is now perceived; but so far from showing that the evangelists were attempting to persuade the world of the presence of the supernatural, it shows only how much at one they were with their world, where the supernatural was as common as natural law in the Nineteenth Century. And some contemporary British New Testament writers suggest that we have recognized the supernatural character of the narratives, meaning we acknowledge this character as being synonymous with the historical Jesus; but this is impossible. On the contrary, it means that the narratives are of a piece with their world, and the particular way they presented them hinged on the accepted world-view. Liberalism rightly saw that such a world-view was gone forever, and attempted restatement; it erred only in its method. I suspect its error was less than that of the dogged traditionalists writing in the same period.

But Mr. Glover might agree with me about this.

Edward C. Hobbs

PASTORAL PREACHING

By David A. MacLennan. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 157 *pp.* $2.50.

Books on preaching that have a lasting value are not written very often. *Pastoral Preaching* by Dr. David A. MacLennan, Professor of Preaching and Pastoral Care at Yale University Divinity School, is a book of this quality.

Considering "pastoral preaching" as the point of view for all preaching rather than as one of the types of preaching, Dr. MacLennan sets down sound principles and procedures in sections entitled "Perspectives," "Objectives," "Resources," "Methods," and "The Pastor Preaching." A lively summary chapter is entitled "The Unifying Word."

Pastoral preaching is defined as "the communication of the good news by one whose relationship to persons is that of shepherd of souls." It is "communication by a man in Christ to individuals in their known needs to the end that by God's grace they may experience newness of life within the community of the Holy Spirit, the Church."

The objectives of pastoral preaching are identified as: 1. To present Christ to men and men to Christ. 2. To help individual Christians to live as citizens of God's Kingdom, here and now. 3. To build the Church in spiritual power, cohesiveness and outgoing usefulness. 4. To teach the faith. 5. To comfort the people with the comfort whereby we are comforted by God in Christ.

The resources for pastoral preaching are: 1. God's enabling. 2. The Bible. 3. Pastoral relationships. 4. Non-fictional current literature. 5. Modern fiction. 6. Older novels. 7. Contemporary plays. 8. Magazines that are devoted to criticism of literature and life. 9. Editorials and news comments. 10. News items. 11. Poetry. 12. The dictionary, to oppose obscurity and cliches. 13. The Christian year, to encourage the preaching of the whole gospel. The resources are treated with sound common sense and with an accurate assessment of relative value.

Methods include systematic study, long-term preparation, and preparation of specific sermons. While the importance of methodical preparation is urged, it is from the sensible point of view that no preacher should be the victim of one method. The pastor who preaches must: 1. Prepare himself as carefully as he prepares his sermon. 2. Give the impression of poise. 3. Preach persuasively. 4. Preach interestingly. 5. Preach naturally. 6. Preach supernaturally. Ways of preaching in the fashion suggested are given in detail, in such a way as to convey a feeling of wholeness rather than that of a series of mechanical techniques.

The language of this book is simple, clear and effective, so that the meaning is conveyed without being obscured by attention to the words and style. However, upon deliberate examination, one becomes aware of the excellence of the language and style, and of the richness of apt illustrations. This is the sincere presentation of a man who is conscious of his subject rather than of himself, and who is highly competent to make such a presentation.

The reviewer recommends *Pastoral Preaching* as a book of long range as well as immediate value.

Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.

WHO SPEAKS FOR GOD?

By Gerald Kennedy. New York, and Dallas: Abingdon Press, 1954. 139 *pp.* $2.50.

This book contains four excellent sermons, addresses, or essays which define a minister in terms of his obligation in his message—for whom and for what he speaks. The titles are: "Who Speaks for Persons!" "Who Speaks for the Spiritual!"; "Who Speaks for Freedom!"; and "Who Speaks for Hope!" The thought is incisive and the language is exceptionally clear and expressive. The elements of responsible courage and social and personal concern are notable. Bishop Kennedy has a sense of appropriateness in the matter of the number, types, and application of illustrations that well might be desired by all preachers who wish to be clearly understood by every listener without sacrificing theological depth and continuity of thought.

Primarily, this book should be of purely personal help to a preacher in re-identifying himself. In turn, his preaching inescapably will be influenced by the timely and stimulating content.

Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.

THE WHOLE ARMOR OF GOD

By Ralph W. Sockman. New York, Nashville and Dallas: Abingdon Press, 1955. 78 *pp.* $1.00.

Dr. Sockman's series of seven sermons

based on Ephesians 6:13-17 effectively conveys the needed emphasis that "religion involves the whole life of man in relation to God." The sermons are models of clarity in structure and language. The prayers which so pertinently follow the sermons are profound in meaning and superb in phrasing. Dr. Sockman undoubtedly could do a major service for his fellow ministers by writing a full-scale book on the content, structure, and phrasing of pastoral prayers.

Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.

THE PASSION OF THE KING

By Frederick C. Grant. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 107 *pp.* $2.50.

This brief book centers on Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter, in its concern to present the heart of the Christian religion. It has a devotional overtone, and at the same time is a perceptive short course in theology and Christian ethics. The sections on the recoverable historical account of Jesus (in opposition to the "all is interpretation" point of view), the atonement, eternal life, and anti-Semitism are especially enlightening and stimulating. This is a good book for a preacher to read to stir and focus his own thinking for the forthcoming Holy Week.

Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.

TOWARD A THEOLOGY OF EVANGELISM

By Julian N. Hartt. New York, Nashville and Dallas: Abingdon Press, 1955. 123 *pp.* $2.00.

Julian N. Hartt is a professor of philosophical theology in Yale University. His Methodist education was at Dakota Wesleyan, Garrett Biblical Institute, and Northwestern University. The little book deserves careful reading by thoughtful ministers who share in the evangelistic task of the Christian church.

A borrowed Calvinism mars the early pages of the study for this reviewer. One does not need to be so deeply pessimistic about us men ("creatures of the dust") to be optimistic about God. Why must other preachments and efforts be labelled "shabby evangelisms"? One reads with amazement the following: "God is Being in whom alone truth is possible and actual. Here we are learning, all of us, a hard and bitter lesson: the truth is not necessarily lovable. Indeed, the more profoundly disillusioned among us feel, and powerfully proclaim, that the truth, the whole truth and the truth about the whole, is more nearly hateful and horrid than lovable."

This is followed by sentences from Neo-Calvinism which few Methodists can believe. "And so we tremble before God the Transcendent, all-terrible in his creativity. He shows no regard for the moral schemes of his creatures. He shows no solicitude for the moral schemes of civilizations and nations, rich and poor, great and small."

But the book gets better as the evangelist succeeds the philosopher-theologian. The final chapter will make the reader want to preach the gospel, to speak God's word. "The power of that word is the power of real, transcendently righteous and creative love. . . Hence, while the church has an utterance to make, sermons to preach, hymns to sing, and prayers to offer, above all it has a life to share. . . This life is God's free sharing of himself in Jesus Christ."

The two chapters on "World Revolution" and "The Living Word in Our Midst" are more than worth the price of the book.

J. T. Carlyon

A PRIEST SPEAKS HIS MIND

By W. E. R. O'Gorman. Glendale, California: O'Gorman Press, 1954. 190 *pp.* $2.25.

Here is the story of a double conversion: from Protestantism to Roman Catholicism, and a return to the "Protestant faith of his fathers." It is the sort of factual statement which every serious Christian should value.

At the age of twenty-one Mr. O'Gorman was persuaded to join "the true church"—and for the next thirty years gave himself without reservation to the Roman Church, first as a layman, then as a priest. As a Paulist father he gave some years to evangelism, seeking to win others to the same

Roman Catholic piety which he practiced. The years have compelled him to renounce both the religious community and the Roman Church. The book is a resume of the experiences which drove him away from Romanism.

The reasons for reconversion to Protestantism appear mainly in the moral and spiritual abuses which he encountered, such as: the totalitarian and undemocratic nature of the church, the persistent political activity of the hierarchy, the denial of all personal liberty to the priest, the lack of conscience in the matter of overindulgence in alcoholic beverages, the setting of the Vatican above every civil as well as religious power, the willingness of the Pope to make peace with unchristian governments if to the advantage of the church, the distortion of history in the textbooks used in parochial schools. These are a few of the facts presented in this personal statement.

The author seeks to be objective and fair, and on the whole does very well. But he has suffered, and now and again a note of bitterness appears. This militates a little against the usefulness of the expose. One wishes at times for more documentary support of some statements. Nevertheless, it is a valuable piece of work and merits a careful reading.

J. T. Carlyon

A DICTIONARY OF PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY

By Vergilius Ferm and others. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. $6.00.

Pastoral psychology has "arrived." It now has a "dictionary."

The intention of Editor Ferm and his six colleagues is to provide ready and brief access to the wide range of material in the world of psychology as it relates to the work of the minister. This is a laudable aim, but can the target be hit with an alphabetical list of topics from "abnormal conduct" to "zelophobia"? My own experience with dictionaries of this kind (of philosophy, of sociology, of other disciplines of learning) can be simply stated: if one knows his way around in the field the dictionary is unnecessary, if one does not know his way around the dictionary is not of much real help. Another way of stating the issue is this: The definition of a concept like "abnormal conduct" (or "neurosis" or "psychotherapy" or "pastoral counseling") cannot really be separated from the context of a whole and basic point of view, a psychological and theological orientation. The brevity and number of "topics" considered in this dictionary prevent the development and clarification of the point of view or orientation out of which the definitions arise. And my impression is that the seven authors do not really share one.

I do not want to discourage potential purchasers of this book, for it may well provide helpful information to a pastor. But I am wary of the assumption that meaningful understanding in this field can be achieved in this way.

Robert E. Elliott

FACE TO FACE WITH INDIA

By Roland E. Wolseley. New York: Friendship Press, 1954. *xii* + 176 *pp. Cloth* $2.50, *Paper* $1.25.

Something more than the usual tourist's-eye view of India, but something less than a profound analysis of the problems which it highlights, this attractive little volume is an interesting addition to the current flow of popular books on enigmatic modern India.

The author, a professor of journalism at Syracuse University, was commissioned to go to India in 1952-53 to help establish a department of journalism at Hislop College in Nagpur, capital of the state of Madhya Pradesh, geographically the heart of India. Finding in this city and its environs a cross-section of Indian culture, Mr. Wolseley conducted a series of interviews with a number of citizens, representing many occupations and social stations. The present book, mildly flavored by a layman's missionary interest, is an analysis of these interviews, set forth with the conviction that in the life and thought (or lack thereof) of these diverse individuals the staggeringly complex problems of India are mirrored accurately.

This method uncovers enough obscure facts and the thesis is sufficiently valid to make the reading of this book a worthwhile, as well as an interesting, experience. Still, by its very nature, this type of study can provide no more than a superficial analysis of really profound psychological and sociological problems. In India, as in every country, the prevailing cultural configuration is so much more than just the sum of its parts that we can not really be brought "face to face with India" by meeting separately a number of her representative citizens. Nevertheless, as you will probably agree, it is good to have made their acquaintance.

H. Neill McFarland

SIGNS & SYMBOLS IN CHRISTIAN ART

By George Ferguson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. 346 *pp.,* 16 *full color plates, over* 350 *illustrations.* $10.00.

This is a handsome volume, of the type often recommended for gift purposes. It considers the great bulk of the symbols (or objects with symbolic value) which appear in Renaissance painting, and indicates their meaning. That such a book is necessary signifies that most of these "symbols" are no longer symbols to us, for they do not communicate to us—at least, not without a commentary on them such as this.

The title is a bit misleading. The signs and symbols considered are not of "Christian Art" in general; "Christian" here means only the Renaissance—a slight restriction—and "Art" means paintings. Even so, Renaissance painting is a wonderful field to consider, and the book is quite useful despite such limitation.

Unfortunately, two criticisms are in order. The first concerns the color reproductions, which are scarcely the quality work we are coming to expect of modern color engravers. Registration of colors is not always perfect, the colors themselves are either garish or dominated by one (wrong) hue, and the over-all effect is one of seeing color reproductions of twenty years ago. Perhaps really fine work would have made the reasonable price impossible; but some readers would surely have paid more for really good color.

The other criticism concerns the text itself (which is beautifully printed, fully worthy of Oxford Press). The meaning of the symbols is often far too pat and uniform, with the result that the explanations are in several cases erroneous. For example, the four evangelists are often symbolized by the four "beasts" of Revelation. Ferguson tells us that Matthew is the man, Mark the lion, Luke the ox, and John the eagle (all with wings, usually). Now, this arrangement is quite common. But so are several others. For example, Mark's symbol is sometimes the eagle, (Irenaeus), sometimes the man (Augustine', sometimes the ox (Pseudo-Athanasius), and sometimes the lion (Victorinus, and then Jerome). Jerome's view became the most popular in the Middle Ages, but uniformity never arrived; so, although the pattern Victorinus worked out in his Commentary on Revelation will explain most Renaissance paintings, it will not do as explaining "Christian Art."

Notwithstanding these criticisms, all things considered it is a lovely and useful book, and well worth the price.

Edward C. Hobbs

THE TEACHING MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

By James D. Smart. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 207 *pp.* $3.00.

That the Church today is living through a period of re-evaluation of its past and the rethinking of its character in the future goes without saying. This is true in all areas of its life, though perhaps in none is this more obvious than in Christian education. Since the present form of Christian education came about under the impact of a now largely defunct liberal theology, this is to be expected. The future of the educational emphasis in Protestantism will be largely determined by the success of this enterprise. Thus, it is with genuine joy that many of us welcome books like *The Teaching Ministry of the Church.* It is also a matter of note that this book was a recent selection of the Religious Book Club.

Dr. Smart is well qualified to assist in

this task of rethinking Christian education. He is now a pastor, and yet was in the midst of the curriculum revision which the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., carried out in the mid 1940's. He is convinced that the Church must teach to be the Church. He is equally convinced that much of its shallow moralistic teaching of recent years is not true to its teaching office. Thus we have here a thought-provoking consideration of what the teaching Church ought to be.

Dr. Smart makes clear that teaching is not something set over against the main stream of the Church, as progressive religious education has sometimes been. Rather it must be the process through which the life of the Church is made real to persons of all ages.

"Christian education exists because the life that came into the world in Jesus Christ demands a human channel of communication that it may reach an ever-widening circle of men, women, and children, and become their life. The aim of Christian teaching is to widen and deepen that human channel, to help forward the growth and enrichment of the human fellowship, through which Jesus Christ moves ever afresh into the life of the world to redeem mankind. The program, therefore, must be such that it will lead people, from their earliest to their latest years, ever more fully and in the most definite way into the faith and life of the Church of Jesus Christ."

At times the author seems to be too little aware of the contributions of progressive religious education. He would go further than Miller in his *The Clue to Christian Education,* which has as its thesis that the one thing needed is for progressive educational methods to be undergirded with a sounder theology. This is not to suggest that Smart would have us return to a purely transmissive type of education. He does place more importance on this phase of the educational process, however. Actually both, Miller and Smart ought to be read in order to complement each other, for truly creative education in the Christian faith is not possible without a fairly adequate amount of transmission. One cannot accept for himself the responsibilities of discipleship unless he knows the historic meaning of discipleship as discovered through the traditions of the Church. Yet to fail to make these traditions existentially relevant is to fall into the trap of mere intellectualism.

This is an important book. It is a book which curriculum makers ought to take seriously. It also ought to be read and pondered over by pastors. If this reviewer were recommending only one book in the field of Christian education, this would be the one. If he could recommend three others, he would add Elliott's *Can Religious Education Be Christian?* to present the progressive point of view; Miller's *The Clue to Christian Education;* and Howe's *Man's Need and God's Action.*

Howard Grimes

YOUNG PEOPLE IN YOUR CHURCH
By Herbert Carleton Mayer. Westwood, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1953. 219 *pp.* $2.50.

One of the most crucial practical problems which the Church faces today is its failing youth program. Recent statistics indicate that slightly more than one-fourth of American youth are active in Church youth groups. Studies like *Elmtown's Youth* further point to the ineffectiveness of the Church's youth program. Thus, we ought to be on the look-out for help in this area.

Mayer's book is helpful, though in all fairness it must be said that it presents nothing new. It is based substantially on existing philosophies of youth work: Meet the needs of young people and hope you can orient them in the direction of Christian values. As such it accomplishes its purpose satisfactorily, and several parts are quite useful. For example: the chapters on understanding adolescense offer in brief compass sound and useful advice in this area. The discussion of worship is quite good. The chapter on adult leadership is a good beginning for a consideration of this central problem. Indeed the book can be recommended as a successful substitute for Harner's earlier book on youth work.

It does not deal with the newer insights in theology, however, as illustrated by such

a statement as this: "An individual's real calling is to live a worthy life of friendliness and usefulness. There is no other good reason for living." The entire program as suggested is based largely on the kind of moralism which seems inadequate for youth in the troubled and unstable world in which their lives are cast. Its theological perspective, indeed, is consistent with the Personalism characteristic of the Seminary where Mayer taught, Boston.

This is to suggest that while appreciating the many helpful suggestions in the book this reviewer feels that it does not go deep enough in facing up to the question: What is the relevance of the Gospel to young people in our troubled age? To answer this question may mean the scrapping of existing philosophies of youth work, their theological undergirdings, and their consequent programs. This does not mean that we discard such insights as those stemming from the understanding of adolescent psychology, and it must be admitted that so long as we have nothing better we must limp along doing the best we can with existing programs.

Yet this is a call for boldness in experimenting in such a manner as to develop new approaches to youth and the Gospel. Dr. Mayer's book does not do this. The patterns we need are not known, but the need for them seems evident. Would that our youth leaders would respond in such boldness!

Howard Grimes

EDUCATION INTO RELIGION

By A. Victor Murray. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. 226 *pp.* $3.00.

The thesis of this volume, clearly indicated in its title, is that Christianity is an attitude to life *into* which the pupil has to grow. In substantiating his thesis Dr. Murray, an English Methodist and president of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, brings a comprehensive view including the psychological, biblical, and theological disciplines. Though he concerns himself primarily with the basic problems of method, his philosophy of religious education is rooted strongly in the Christian faith. The nature of the Christian religion is seen as having a fundamental relationship to any discussion of methodological issues. He insists that "there is something to know, something to feel, something to choose, something to do, and something to belong to. Knowledge, feeling, morals, action and belonging are all involved."

There is much in this author's educational approach with which both the traditionalist and the more modern progressive educator will agree. However, each will find his position under the most stringent judgment as President Murray, in a practical manner, illustrates his major criticisms of existing situations and proposes his own methods grounded in the deepest awareness of the human situation as well as the fundamentals of the Christian faith. At all times he insists upon awareness of the psychological and sociological fuundations underlying the various stages of human growth and development. It is his earnest desire to have the evidences of these disciplines related to the Church's resources of Bible, doctrine, worship and fellowship. The reader must bear in mind that, when President Murray deals with *The Bible in Education,* he is dealing primarily with a teaching situation which is peculiar to certain counties in England. This does not in any way discount the implications which this volume holds for our teaching of religion in this country. As a matter of fact, it is packed with suggestive insights for those who are deeply concerned with the issues involved in the relation of religion and educational method. This is a highly commendable treatment of a most important subject.

Charles H. Johnson

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

Volume 4. Edited by George Buttrick and others. New York, Nashville and Dallas: Abingdon Press, 1955. 957 *pp.* $8.75.

Another volume of the indispensable series of commentaries is available, this one covering Psalms and Proverbs.

William R. Taylor was assigned the task of writing the Introduction and Exegesis for the Psalms, and completed the Exegesis of

the bulk of them before his death. His colleague at the University of Toronto, W. Stewart McCullough, completed the Exegesis and wrote the Introduction. The task of Exposition was divided: Psalms 1-41 by J. R. P. Sclater (died in 1949; minister of Old St. Andrew's Church in Toronto); Psalms 42-89 by Edwin McNeill Poteat (now pastor of Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh, N.C.); Psalms 90-150 by Frank H. Ballard (minister emeritus of Hampstead Garden Suburb Free Church, London).

The Introduction and Exegesis of Proverbs was written by Charles T. Fritsch of Princeton Seminary, and the Exposition by Rolland W. Schloerb (pastor of Hyde Park Baptist Church, Chicago).

Praise of the series has become superfluous, and I shall not heap up more words in its favor, save to comment that the writing by Taylor and McCullough, both Introduction and Exegesis of Psalms, is exceptionally fine, lucid, and helpful. In mild criticism, it should be noted that a tendency often present in the Exposition has, in this volume in certain cases, become quite irritating and space-wasting—namely, the criticism and "correction" of the Exegesis by the expositor. Of course he has a right to disagree with the exegete; indeed, many scholars might take issue with many points in the Exegesis—nevertheless, they cannot be given space in the commentary itself to express their disagreement. The purpose of the Exposition section is to give exposition, not to provide the expositor with a sounding board for his own critical views relative to the Exegesis. Indeed, in many cases—one of the writers is quite glaringly at fault here—the "criticism" is quite sophomoric, more befitting a freshman theologue's first essays than the pages of "Christendom's Most Comprehensive Commentary." Inasmuch as the same blight infects the pulpit itself (by which means the minister "proves" himself to be a "real scholar"), it might be too much to expect it to be absent from any commentary. But what an example!

Edward C. Hobbs

JESUS AND THE FUTURE

An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse in Mark with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory. By G. R. Beasley-Murray. London (dist. in New York): St. Martin's Press, 1954. 287 *pp.* $5.00.

This is scholarship in the old style—i.e., it reads about like a research thesis. Just about everything anyone has written since 1864 on Mark 13 is summarized here. The dragon to be slain is the Little Apocalypse theory (a popular dragon to be gotten after in recent years). Mark 13 seems to have been responsible for Henry Sidgwick becoming an agnostic in 1910; and opponents of the Christian Faith often quote it in open-air demonstrations. Hence, the author felt compelled to study it carefully.

Wondrous to behold, he discovers that in all likelihood it authentically reproduces Jesus' words, a view which he says "may be condemned . . . as conceding too much to modern opinion." This is modern?

Edward C. Hobbs

JESUS AND THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS

By Walter E. Bundy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955. *xxiii* + 598 *pp.* $7.50.

Professor Bundy of DePauw and the Harvard Press have together produced a most elaborate, comprehensive, and handsome volume devoted to the exposition of the total material in the Synoptic Gospels. The outline of the work follows the arrangement of gospel material as presented by Mr. Bundy in a previous work, *A Syllabus and Synopsis of the First Three Gospels.* The perspective from which the gospel narratives are viewed may be said to be that of German and French liberalism as the work of that era was standardized by such persons as Erich Klostermann, Johannes Weiss, Friedrich Spitta, Hermann Gunkel, Hugo Gressmann, Paul Wernle, Julius Wellhausen, Wilhelm Bousset, Alfred Loisy, Maurice Goguel, and by Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann in their Form-History researches.

The footnotes to the volume list almost a complete bibliography of, mainly, liberal German and French authors. While English-speaking scholars are not ignored, they play no such part in opinions noted as do the German and French groups. This volume, therefore, is of particular importance to New Testament students who do not have German literature available. Mr. Bundy has digested well this vast mass of stimulating research and brings it to his readers in fresh and interesting form. In both spirit and perspective the book is similar to the admirable commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels by Claude Montefiore, the noted liberal Jewish scholar, although the arrangement of the material is different.

There are newer developments and perspective in Synoptic study which find no reflection in the book, but it is a most impressive summary of the work of an era.

Fred D. Gealy

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF JESUS

By Charles M. Laymon. New York, Nashville and Dallas: The Abingdon Press, 1955. 336 *pp.* $3.00.

THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS

By Vincent Taylor. New York, Nashville and Dallas: The Abingdon Press, 1955. 240 *pp.* $4.00.

In one year the Abingdon Press presents us with two "Lives" of Jesus. This is indeed interesting and makes one wonder if they are the proverbial straws indicating a change in the wind. For all the critical pressures of the twentieth century from Wrede to Bultmann have tended to act as a solvent tending to dissolve the framework in which the sayings, narratives, events which go to make up the gospels, leaving them like unstrung beads, and frequently the "seat-in-life" of the materials themselves is found in a context later than that of Jesus. The convincing power of the arguments of Form-criticism has made it difficult if not impossible for an author who writes a "biography" of Jesus to know where to begin.

Vincent Taylor is convinced that the case for historical pessimism has been overdone. He believes that the time has come to begin moving in the opposite direction. He therefore, cautiously, offers his book as a step in the new direction. Vincent Taylor always writes interesting, knowingly, and with religious insight. Yet this reviewer cannot see that he has really made his case here.

Mr. Laymon has prepared a textbook for college students. The composition of the book is admirable. There are twenty-six chapters beginning with "The World in which Jesus Lived" and ending with "Jesus as Lord." The material is lucidly presented. Each chapter is supplemented with a series of suggestive questions for discussion and a bibliography. There is just perhaps no text book on the subject that is quite as practical and usable as this one. Yet, again, the reviewer has the impression that this book should have been written twenty-five years ago, and that it doesn't quite have a mid-twentieth century bite. However, we are undoubtedly in a very difficult period for knowing how to present Jesus to the world. It is so hard to release him so that he can make a somewhat similar terrific impact upon us to that which he made on his own time in the days of his flesh.

Fred D. Gealy

REDISCOVERING PRAYER

By John L. Casteel. New York: Association Press. 1955. *xiii* + 242 *pp.* $3.50.

Students in the classes of Professor Casteel when he taught in Perkins' summer school a few years ago will be interested in reading his devout and thoughtful book on prayer. The treatment is both theoretical and practical. For anyone to read this book earnestly is to rediscover prayer. If you are wondering about this matter, there is help here for you.

Fred D. Gealy